

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, April 30, 1930

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the creator and saviour of the world, take every vision that beckons us, every hope that fires us, and every truth that illuminates and saves us, and hold their possibilities in Thy grasp. O God, we have souls to save, characters to build, passions to master, and virtues to achieve. Do Thou help us to that which all the world needs until we find our crowns in Thee. By industry, by discipline and intelligent, conscientious devotion to high purpose, may we reach those roomy thoughts tested and tried by the facts of knowledge and experience. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have five days in which to file minority views on the bill H. R. 9673.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that he may have five days in which to file minority views on the bill H. R. 9673. Is there objection?

Mr. CABLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the title of the bill.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. It is a bill to return visa fees to aliens. The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## ANNE FALKENRECK

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

## House Resolution 209

*Resolved*, That there shall be paid, out of the contingent fund of the House, to Anne Falkenreck, sister of Carl F. Falkenreck, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to six months' compensation and an additional amount not exceeding \$250 to defray funeral expenses and last illness of the said Carl F. Falkenreck.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

## THREE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE MASSACHUSETTS BAY COLONY

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes for the purpose of extending an invitation to the Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday of this week there will land at Hoover Field an airplane known as the *New Arbella*, carrying a message of good will from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to her sister States in the Union and asking them to join with us this summer and autumn in commemorating the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Massachusetts Bay Colony. My scholarly colleague [Mr. Luce] a few days ago summarized the significance of the events of 1630, and outlined the plans for 1930.

It was the good ship *Arbella* which dropped anchor in Boston Bay in 1630 to permit Gov. John Winthrop and his Puritan followers to select their home sites on the pleasant peninsula which the Indians called Shawmut, and which the modern world knows as the progressive and hospitable city of Boston. It is a far cry from the old *Arbella* to the gleaming ship of the air which will come to rest on Hoover Field Saturday afternoon. This airplane comes under the joint auspices of the American Legion, which is to hold its national convention in Boston in October, and of the Boston Herald, one of our great newspapers. President Hoover has already promised to attend the Legion convention, and the crew of the *New Arbella* pauses here to transmit the official invitations of the Legion officials and of the governor of the Commonwealth and the mayor of Boston. There will also be an invitation to every Member of Congress to join with us in this great celebration, and to that end I urge as many of my colleagues as can conveniently do so to join us at Hoover Field on Saturday afternoon to take part in the landing of the *New Arbella*.

You men of the West and South at times think of New England as a little detached corner of the land, too satisfied with its past to be concerned with our joint present and future as a great Nation. We are confident that if you will just spend a day or two with us this summer or fall; if you will make the pilgrimage with us from Lexington, Concord, and Bunker Hill, to Faneuil Hall to Plymouth and Provincetown, to Salem, Marblehead, and Gloucester, to our Berkshire and Blue Hills, the Mohawk Trail and the Deerfield Valley, to Cape Cod, and yes, to the frigate *Constitution*, which will then be completely restored; if you will breathe the invigorating air from off the great sea which lies at our door, you will go back home with a friendlier feeling and with the deep conviction that whether we speak with a Yankee twang, with a slow southern drawl, or with the well-rounded syllables of the great West, we share a common love for a great nation and for the flag which flies so proudly over every square mile of it. [Applause.]

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute for the purpose of asking a question of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. PATTERSON. I would like to ask the gentleman from New Jersey how long he thinks he is going to be in the consideration of the radio bill?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I think we will be through very shortly.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, if we get through with the radio bill and the special orders by 3 o'clock or 3.15, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one hour. If I can not have the time to-day, I ask unanimous consent that on next Tuesday I may address the House for one hour.

Mr. TILSON. We shall agree that the gentleman may have one hour to-day, but not next Tuesday.

Mr. PATTERSON. If we get through by 3 o'clock or 3.15 this afternoon, I would like to address the House for one hour.

Mr. TILSON. Of course, the gentleman would have to take his time after the other special orders.

Mr. PATTERSON. I understand that I would follow the other special orders.

Mr. TILSON. There are three special orders ahead of the gentleman already, and there is no objection to the gentleman having time after these special orders.

Mr. PATTERSON. The gentleman will remember I talked with him yesterday about the matter, and also with the gentleman from New York. I have been trying to get in for several days.

Mr. TILSON. I have talked with the gentleman from New Jersey, who is in charge of the bill, and it would seem that it will probably be finished in a couple of hours. We already have special orders which will consume 1 hour and 45 minutes, so the gentleman might have time by 3.30, or something like that, or probably earlier, depending on the opposition to the bills to be considered to-day.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, following the special orders for to-day, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for one hour.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that following the address of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] to-day he may address the House for one hour. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## AMENDMENT OF THE RADIO ACT OF 1927

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday, and the Clerk will call the committees.

The Clerk called the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries I call up the bill (H. R. 11635) to amend the radio act of 1927, approved February 23, 1927, and for other purposes, on the House Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey calls up a bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That subparagraph (f) of section 1 of the radio act of 1927 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 47, sec. 81) is amended by inserting after the words "within the" the words "jurisdiction of the," so that as amended said subparagraph shall read: "or (f) upon any aircraft or other mobile stations within the jurisdiction of the United States, except under and in accordance with this act and with a license in that behalf granted under the provisions of this act."

Sec. 2. Section 2 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 47, sec. 82) is amended by striking out the word "and" before the word "Alaska" in the last line

of said section, by striking out the period at the end of the section and inserting in lieu thereof a comma, and by adding the words "Guam, and eastern Samoa," so that the last line of said section 2, as amended, shall read: "California, the Territory of Hawaii, Alaska, Guam, and eastern Samoa."

SEC. 3. The first paragraph of section 3 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 47, sec. 83) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The chairman shall be elected annually. The commission shall also elect annually a vice chairman, who shall, during the absence of the chairman, assume and perform the duties of that office."

SEC. 4. Paragraph (f) of section 4 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 47, sec. 84) is amended by striking out the words "in the character of emitted signals" and inserting after the word "unless," in the sixth line thereof, the words "after a hearing," so that as amended the proviso will read as follows: "Provided, however, That changes in the wave lengths, authorized power, or in the times of operation of any station shall not be made without the consent of the station licensee unless, after a hearing, in the judgment of the commission such changes will promote public convenience or interest or will serve public necessity or the provisions of this act will be more fully complied with."

Paragraph (k) of said section is amended by striking out the first sentence and by inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"The commission may conduct its proceedings in such manner as will best conduce to the proper dispatch of business and the ends of justice. The commission shall have the power to require by subpoena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of all books, papers, tariffs, contracts, agreements, and documents relating to any matter under investigation. Any representative of the commission and any examiner appointed by the commission may administer oaths and affirmations and sign subpoenas. In case of failure to comply with any subpoena or in case of the contumacy of any witness appearing at any hearing before an examiner, the commission, or a division thereof, the commission may invoke the aid of any district court of the United States. Such a court may thereupon order the witness to comply with the requirements of the subpoena or to give evidence which is relevant to the matter in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt thereof."

"A majority of the commission shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, but no commissioner shall participate in any hearing or proceedings in which he has a pecuniary interest. The commission may, from time to time, make or amend such general rules or orders as may be requisite for the order and regulation of the proceedings before it, including forms of notices and the service thereof, which shall conform, as nearly as may, to those in use in the courts of the United States. Any party may appear before the commission or any division thereof or before an examiner and be heard in person or by attorney. Every vote and official act of the commission, or of any division thereof, shall be entered of record, and its proceedings shall be public upon the request of any party interested."

"The commission may order testimony to be taken by deposition in any proceeding or investigation pending under this act at any stage of such proceeding or investigation. Such depositions may be taken before any person designated by the commission and having power to administer oaths. Such testimony shall be reduced to writing by the person taking the deposition, or under his direction, and shall then be subscribed by the deponent. Any person may be compelled to appear and depose and to produce documentary evidence in the same manner as witnesses may be compelled to appear and testify and produce documentary evidence before the commission as hereinbefore provided."

"Witnesses summoned before the commission shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States, and witnesses whose depositions are taken and the persons taking the same shall severally be entitled to the same fees as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States. Witnesses shall be paid by the party subpoenaing them."

"No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing documentary evidence before the commission or in obedience to the subpoena of the commission on the ground or for the reason that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise, required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture. But no natural person shall be prosecuted or subject to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he may testify, or produce evidence, documentary or otherwise, before the commission in obedience to a subpoena issued by it: *Provided*, That no natural person so testifying shall be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying."

SEC. 5. Section 9 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 47, sec. 89) is amended by striking out the period at the end of the third paragraph, inserting a comma, and adding the following: "but action of the licensing authority with reference to the granting of such application shall be limited to and governed by the same considerations and practice which affect the granting of original applications."

SEC. 6. Section 10 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 47, sec. 90) is amended by striking out the first sentence and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The licensing authority may grant licenses, renewal of licenses, and modification of licenses only upon written application

therefor received by it: *Provided, however*, That in cases of emergency found by the commission licenses, renewals of licenses, and modifications of licenses, for stations on vessels or aircraft of the United States, may be issued under such conditions as the commission may impose, without such formal application. Such licenses, however, shall in no case be for a longer term than three months."

SEC. 7. The first paragraph of section 12 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 47, sec. 92) is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof, inserting a colon, and by adding the following: "*Provided, however*, That nothing herein shall prevent the licensing of radio apparatus on board any vessel, aircraft, or other mobile station of the United States when the installation and use of such apparatus is required by act of Congress or treaty to which the United States is a party."

SEC. 8. Section 14 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 47, sec. 94) is amended by striking out the words "Any station license shall be revocable by the commission," and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Any station license may be revoked, modified, or suspended by the commission."

Said section is further amended by striking out all of the proviso and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided, however*, That no license shall be revoked, modified, or suspended until the licensee shall have been notified in writing of the proceedings for such revocation, modification, or suspension, the cause for the proposed action, and shall have been given reasonable opportunity to show cause why an order of revocation, modification, or suspension should not be issued."

SEC. 9. Section 16 of the radio act of 1927 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 47, sec. 96) is amended by striking out the whole of said section and by inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 16. (a) An appeal may be taken, in the manner hereinafter provided, from decisions of the commission to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia in any of the following cases:

"(1) By any applicant for a station license, or for renewal of an existing station license, or for modification of an existing station license, whose application is refused by the commission.

"(2) By any licensee whose license is revoked, modified, or suspended by the commission.

"(3) By any other person, firm, or corporation aggrieved by whose interests are adversely affected by any decision of the commission granting or refusing any such application or by any decision of the commission revoking, modifying, or suspending an existing station license.

"Such appeal shall be taken by filing with said court within 20 days after the decision complained of is effective, notice in writing of said appeal and a statement of the reasons therefor, together with proof of service of a true copy of said notice and statement upon the commission. Unless a later date is specified by the commission as part of its decision, the decision complained of shall be considered to be effective as of the date on which public announcement of the decision is made at the office of the commission in the city of Washington.

"(b) The commission shall thereupon immediately, and in any event not later than five days from the date of such service upon it, mail or otherwise deliver a copy of said notice of appeal to each person, firm, or corporation shown by the records of the commission to be interested in such appeal and to have a right to intervene therein under the provisions of this section, and shall at all times thereafter permit any such person, firm, or corporation to inspect and make copies of the appellant's statement of reasons for said appeal at the office of the commission in the city of Washington. Within 30 days after the filing of said appeal the commission shall file with the court the originals or certified copies of all papers and evidence presented to it upon the application involved or upon its order revoking, modifying, or suspending a license, and also a like copy of its decision thereon, and shall within 30 days thereafter file a full statement in writing of the facts and grounds for its decision as found and given by it, and a list of all interested persons, firms, or corporations to whom it has mailed or otherwise delivered a copy of said notice of appeal.

"(c) Within 30 days after the filing of said appeal any interested person, firm, or corporation may intervene and participate in the proceedings had upon said appeal by filing with the court a notice of intention to intervene and a verified statement showing the nature of the interest of such party, together with proof of service of true copies of said notice and statement both upon appellant and upon the commission. Any person, firm, or corporation who would be aggrieved or whose interests would be adversely affected by a reversal or modification of the decision of the commission complained of shall be considered an interested party.

"(d) At the earliest convenient time the court shall hear and determine the appeal upon the record before it, and shall have power, upon such record, to enter a judgment affirming or reversing the decision of the commission, and in event the court shall render a decision and enter an order reversing the decision of the commission it shall remand the case to the commission to carry out the judgment of the court: *Provided, however*, That the review by the court shall be limited to questions of law and that findings of fact by the commission, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, unless it shall clearly appear that the findings of the commission are arbitrary or capricious or that the action of the commission constitutes an abuse of sound discretion.



The court's judgment shall be final, subject, however, to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon writ of certiorari on petition therefor under section 347 of title 28 of the Judicial Code by appellant, by the commission, or by any interested party intervening in the appeal.

"(e) The court may, in its discretion, enter judgment for costs in favor of or against an appellant and/or other interested parties intervening in said appeal, but not against the commission, depending upon the nature of the issues involved upon said appeal and the outcome thereof."

SEC. 10. Section 30 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 47, sec. 110) is amended by inserting in the first proviso thereof after the word "Alaska" the words "Guam, eastern Samoa."

SEC. 11. Section 32 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 47, sec. 112) is amended by striking out the last four words and by inserting in lieu the following: "each and every day during which such offense occurs."

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 11635 is a bill to amend the radio act of 1927 in various particulars. It does not in any way amend substantive law with respect to radio but merely amends the act in matters of administration and procedure. It contains no provision that has not the unanimous approval of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries and also the approval of the Radio Commission. All matters upon which there were differences of opinion, either in the Radio Commission or in the committee of the House, were eliminated.

These changes in administration and procedure have, since the act of 1927 has been in operation, been found desirable and almost necessary. The act of 1927, creating the Radio Commission and vesting that commission with functions heretofore exercised in part only by the Secretary of Commerce and creating new Federal control over radio broadcasting and vesting that in the commission, of course set up an entirely new activity within the Federal Government. As I have said, in the course of time it was found that it was desirable to particularize the procedure in certain cases, to change various provisions with respect to appeals, with respect to notices, and with respect to the revocation, modification, or suspension of licenses, and this bill, which has been in the course of preparation for almost 12 months, is the result.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Do these changes in the right of appeal restrict or broaden the right of appeal?

Mr. LEHLBACH. They do not affect the right of appeal, but merely modify the procedure by means of which an appeal is, in the first instance, brought to the attention of the court and, in the second instance, the manner in which it is heard and the judgments entered; but it does not in any way take from a radio owner, a prospective radio owner, or applicant any substantial rights.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. I take it that the revision of the law, as recommended by the committee, so far as the basic principles upon which the court may proceed, is rather in opposition to the position that the court took heretofore in reviewing a decision of the commission. I refer to the language as found in section 16, and have in mind the decision of the Supreme Court that passed upon and reversed the decision of the commission so far as the Schenectady broadcasting station case is concerned. I assume under this language the lower court would not have been privileged to set aside the finding of the commission; and I direct the chairman's attention to the language in the proviso of subparagraph (d) that the review by the court shall be limited to questions of law and that findings of fact by the commission, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, unless it shall clearly appear that the findings of the court are arbitrary or capricious and that the action of the commission constitutes an abuse of sound discretion. This was not the rule that the court followed in passing upon the action of the commission in the General Electric Co.'s broadcasting case.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Because it was not necessary at that time for the court to find affirmatively that the ruling of the commission was arbitrary or capricious or an abuse of sound discretion. The purpose of this proviso is not to deprive the courts entirely of going into issues of facts or considerations of fact, but to accept, in the first instance, the findings of fact by the commission, unless the courts find that for some reason such findings are unjustifiable, in which event the courts shall have the right to go into the facts as well as the law.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, I had occasion to review that decision rather closely, and I thought that the court usurped the powers of the commission in passing upon facts. Under this phraseology the rights of the commis-

sion will be safeguarded so that the court will not determine facts or be a fact-finding body but will leave the fact finding to the commission.

Mr. LEHLBACH. In that case the court assumed to hear the matter de novo without regard to the previous testimony taken or action thereon by the commission, and that was never the intention of the original framers of the radio act.

Mr. STAFFORD. And without having the broad field of vision that the commission must necessarily have in determining such questions.

Mr. LEHLBACH. As the gentleman says, without having such broad vision, because the granting of a license or of a certain time or of a certain wave length is not an isolated proposition. It is something that must be done in relation to the entire broadcasting field and with respect to the availability of wave lengths, power, and time. For this reason this provision carries into effect only what the original framers of the act of 1927 intended.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit further, the court in that case virtually set itself up as a fact-finding commission and did not take into consideration the expert knowledge that the commission had in determining the question before it.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Briefly, to discuss the precise changes that have been made in existing law, section 1 of this bill provides that section 2 is amended by including within the jurisdiction of the Radio Commission and embracing within the purview of the radio act Guam and eastern Samoa, two American possessions, which were inadvertently omitted from the original act, so that as well as Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, and so forth, Guam and eastern Samoa are included. So, consequently, wherever the jurisdiction of the United States goes, the provisions of the radio law go.

The third section of the bill provides that the chairman of the Radio Commission shall be elected annually and that the commission shall also elect a vice chairman, who shall, during the absence of the chairman, assume and perform the duties of that office.

The existing law on this subject merely provided originally for the appointment of a chairman when the Radio Commission was first constituted and then provided that thereafter the chairman shall be chosen by the commission itself, but it did not fix any term for the chairman to be thus elected, nor does it designate or authorize anybody to perform the functions which are by various parts of the act vested in the chairman and which in his absence must necessarily be held in abeyance.

The fourth section amends paragraph (f) of section 4 of the radio act by omitting the words "in the character of emitted signals."

Paragraph (f) provides—

That changes in the wave lengths, authorized power, in the character of emitted signals, or in the times of operation of any station, shall not be made without the consent of the station licensee.

On the recommendation of the Radio Commission the words "in the character of emitted signals" were omitted. They seem to have fallen into disuse and nobody really knows what actually is intended to be covered by this term; and, furthermore, it is provided that these changes shall not be made unless, after a hearing, in the judgment of the commission, such changes will promote public convenience or interest.

The requirement that these changes should not be made until a hearing was accorded was not in the original law and the propriety of such a procedure must be manifest.

The next amendment strikes out these words:

Have authority to hold hearings, summon witnesses, administer oaths, compel the production of books, documents, and papers, and to make such investigations as may be necessary in the performance of its duties.

And in lieu thereof there is substituted the rights and powers of the commission to hold hearings and to summon witnesses and to make investigations in great particularity.

The procedure is set out in detail instead of merely in general language, because it was found that without the procedure set forth in the law, where it is available to all those who may have an interest and who desire to appear and participate in such proceeding, the method of proceeding and their rights, and so forth, would be in question. They would not know how to proceed, and the procedure set up here follows as closely as circumstances will permit the procedure in the Interstate Commerce Commission, which has been tested for a long period and has been found to work very satisfactorily.

Section 5 amends section 9 of the act by adding to the provision, which says:

No license granted for the operation of a broadcasting station shall be for a longer term than three years and no license so granted for any other class of station shall be for a longer term than five years, and any license granted may be revoked as hereinafter provided. Upon the expiration of any license, upon application therefor, a renewal of such license may be granted from time to time for a term of not to exceed three years in the case of broadcasting licenses and not to exceed five years in the case of other licenses.

#### The language:

But action of the licensing authority with reference to the granting of such application shall be limited to and governed by the same considerations and practice which affect the granting of original applications.

The equity of such a provision is obvious.

Section 7 amends section 12 of the act. Section 12 of the act restricts the granting of licenses to American citizens or American corporations or companies or associations, but that limitation is subject to the following proviso in the bill:

*Provided, however,* That nothing herein shall prevent the licensing of radio apparatus on board any vessel, aircraft, or other mobile station of the United States when the installation and use of such apparatus is required by act of Congress or treaty to which the United States is a party.

There are circumstances where the law of the United States, or where international agreement with respect to safety at sea, or with respect to radio, make it necessary to install a station on such vessel, aircraft, or other mobile station, although such property may be owned by an alien, in which case the limitation that no license shall be granted to an alien does not apply.

Section 8 of the bill amends section 14 of the radio act by substituting for the words "any station license shall be revocable by the commission," the following words:

Any station license may be revoked, modified, or suspended by the commission.

The greater power certainly was intended to include the lesser power, but by inadvertence it was not put in the original act.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. What would modification be? What is the license but the right to use a wave length? What is modification?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Restricting the time, for example. A station may operate six hours a day and the license may not be revoked, but it may be modified to grant the station only four hours a day.

Section 9 amends section 16 of the act providing for appeals to the courts. The only substantial change excepting as to the time of filing papers and the time of replying to pleadings, and so forth, is the change already called to the attention of the House by the question of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], and that provision, which is carried in this bill, merely makes effective the intent of the framers of the original act of 1927, and the intent of Congress when it passed that act.

Mr. CLARK of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Maryland. Did the committee consider at all the advisability of leaving findings of fact exclusively to the commission?

Mr. LEHLBACH. The committee has determined on that as follows—

Mr. CLARK of Maryland. Oh, I read the report, and I understand what the report says. I am simply asking whether the committee considered the advisability of leaving the finding of fact exclusively to the commission, giving the court only the right to review questions of law.

Mr. LEHLBACH. That was discussed in committee, and it was deemed inadvisable to withdraw entirely from the courts the right to review findings of fact, but it limits it to this, that the review by the courts shall be limited to law, and that findings of fact by the commission, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, unless it shall clearly appear that the findings of the commission are arbitrary or capricious, or that the action of the commission constitutes an abuse of sound discretion.

Mr. CLARK of Maryland. That is practically the same language that we find in all the commission laws, but notwithstanding that language we find the courts constantly reversing the findings of fact by the commission. Just now the whole country is considering the advisability of limiting the courts to questions of law, and leaving the findings of fact exclusively to the commission. This language is not different, so far as limitations upon the power of the court are concerned, from

language found in similar laws, we will say, for illustration, State commission laws, all over the country. The courts get around the language such as the gentleman has in this bill.

Mr. LEHLBACH. On the other hand, the committee did not feel that at this time it ought to report to the House a provision which renders one within the jurisdiction of the Radio Commission entirely without remedy in the event of a palpably gross abuse of discretion.

Mr. CLARK of Maryland. We are hoping that sooner or later some legislative body will be bold enough to say to the courts that they are going to review questions of law and leave questions of fact to those better able to determine them. In other words, that the commissioners, hearing the whole case and having the witnesses before them and studying all the facts, should know the facts better than the court before whom no witnesses appear. Courts are constantly reversing commissions on questions of fact, when the commissions are better able to determine those facts than are the courts.

Mr. LEHLBACH. The remaining changes in the existing law effected by this bill include an amendment to section 30 of the radio act making the penalty for violations of regulations and restrictions by license holders conform to the same penalty that other acts of this kind generally carry. Instead of saying that violators shall be fined \$500 for each and every offense—and a continuing violation may be deemed one offense—it imposes a fine of \$100 for each and every day, which is in accordance with the penalties in the case of other Government-regulated activities.

These briefly are the changes carried in this bill, and in the opinion of the committee reporting the same they have greatly improved and clarified the radio act; and as I say, the bill comes as a unanimous report of the Committee on the Merchant Marine, and has the support of the Radio Commission.

I reserve the balance of my time. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH] has fully explained the contents of this bill and its purpose. However, I shall make a few observations in regard to the subject.

The first general radio act was enacted by Congress in 1912 and continued to be the only law upon the subject until the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries reported a bill which was enacted into law in 1927 and is known as the radio act of 1927. Then in 1928 we amended the law in certain particulars, the chief of which was the enactment of the equalization provision, undertaking to insure an equal and equitable distribution of radio facilities as between different zones and between different States.

Radio is a comparatively new subject. I do not suppose that we have ever had any art which has developed so rapidly or any industry which has grown as rapidly as radio. The tremendous growth and the rapid development of the industry have changed conditions very rapidly. Radio being a new subject, from the scientific standpoint and the public-service standpoint and the industrial standpoint, any legislation that was enacted was necessarily experimental. On the whole, the radio legislation has met the situation fairly well.

However, in the actual administration of the law and in the light of actual experience it has developed to the satisfaction of the Radio Commission and of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries that certain amendments to the law should be adopted, and the pending bill undertakes to effectuate some changes along that line.

These changes are practically all of a procedural and administrative character. As has been explained by the gentleman from New Jersey, the two outstanding changes are those relating to the hearings before the commission and those relating to appeals from the commission to the courts. The act of 1927 was perhaps not comprehensive and definite enough in these particulars. At any rate, differences of opinion arose as to the proper interpretation of the law, both with respect to hearings and the right of parties thereto and also in respect to appeals, and interpretations have been made that were not in accord with the purpose and views of the committee which reported the original bill.

With respect to the subject of hearings, the amendments proposed make it very clear and definite how the hearings shall be held, and insure any interested party the right to be heard. The same is true with respect to the right of appeal to the courts. Any party aggrieved is given the right to appeal to the court; and then we have made it clear in the proposed amendment that an appeal shall lie to the Supreme Court of the United States upon a proper showing by petition for a writ of certiorari.



There are some other features which have already been explained by the gentleman from New Jersey, and which I shall not review. However, the committee is of the opinion that all of the proposed changes are in the interest of clarity, in the interest of simplicity, in the interest of justice, and in the final analysis in the public interest.

There has been a great deal of discussion of the work of the Federal Radio Commission and of their administration of the existing law. There is a wide diversity of opinion as to whether their administration has been wise or unwise. There has been and is now more or less dissatisfaction on the part of different individuals and different sections. No law can be enacted, no law can be so administered with respect to radio, that will perfectly meet the situation or will satisfy everybody, for the simple reason that we have long since reached the point where the demand for radio facilities, not only broadcasting but commercial; in other words, radiotelegraphic facilities—that it is impossible to commence to meet the demand, and the demand is growing rapidly all the time. Consequently the duty and responsibility now devolves upon the commission to determine those to whom facilities shall be granted, the terms upon which they shall be granted, and those to whom facilities shall be denied. Of course, those who seek facilities and fail to obtain them will naturally be dissatisfied.

Therefore much of the dissatisfaction grows out of a natural situation for which neither the law nor the commission is responsible. However, I do not want to be understood as giving expression to the opinion that the administration of the law has been ideal. In my opinion, it has been far from ideal. While I think the commission has performed its services very well in many respects, and while I think they have improved the situation to a great extent, still I think they have failed in several important respects.

Referring particularly to the equalization amendment which was enacted in 1928, and which I had the honor to prepare and to propose, there has been a great deal of discussion of the reallocation which went into effect thereunder on November 11, 1928, together with changes subsequently made. I think that the commission, acting under that amendment, improved the situation to a great extent. They effected a much more equitable distribution than had previously existed, but, as their own figures show, they have not yet effectuated anything like perfect equalization of broadcasting facilities.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS. I yield.

Mr. SLOAN. I think there is a bill pending which has as a basis for distribution three factors—one, the State itself; one, the area; and one, population. Does that bill appeal to the gentleman as a satisfactory or an almost satisfactory basis for distribution of rights?

Mr. DAVIS. I have given some considerable study to that proposal in the light of the situation and the present law. I think it is worthy of careful consideration, but I am not prepared at this time to accord my approval to it.

In that connection I wish to say to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] that the equalization amendment which was first reported by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries embraced not only the factor of population but also of geographical area. However, when the bill was reported to the House in that form, considerable opposition developed to the application of the area feature; so much so that it was indicated we would be unable to obtain a rule for the consideration of the bill with that provision in it. Whereupon our committee reconsidered that feature and reported a bill providing for distribution upon a population basis and omitting the criterion with respect to geographical area.

My opinion is that if we undertake to inject issues of geographical areas and, particularly, State rights, we will find it a very controversial proposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. DAVIS. As I stated in the outset, I think the proposal is worthy of serious and careful consideration, particularly the geographical feature. In fact, the present law, I think, would possibly permit the location of additional stations in large geographical areas, where it would not interfere with the use of the facility elsewhere. Of course, the law might be clarified or liberalized along that line.

I wish to state, however, that my opinion is that the extent to which the present law has proven unsatisfactory to the public as a whole is due to two things primarily. The first is the fact that the commission cleared 40 of the 89 channels available for broadcasting and then allocated 38 of those 40 cleared chan-

nels to chain stations; in other words, to stations which were broadcasting the same program that scores of other stations throughout the country were broadcasting. And the remaining stations, to the number of considerably more than 500, were crowded together on the remaining 49 channels.

In the second place, I think that they have injured the situation and the reception most materially by granting superpower to many stations. Personally, after years and years of study of this subject and after discussing it with listeners and engineers and broadcasters and people of every kind and description from all sections of the country, I am convinced that superpower causes infinitely more harm by blanketing and heterodyning stations on the other channels than any possible benefit that can accrue to the few stations that are permitted to employ this high power. The harmful effects of superpower far outweigh any benefits thereof.

Mr. COYLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS. I yield.

Mr. COYLE. Has the gentleman from Tennessee had his attention called to cases where stations located in the same channel were given, in some cases, forty times the power that other stations in the same channel were given? I have had that called to my attention, and it seems to me the gentleman has hit on the very difficulty that causes nine-tenths of the trouble that we have with the local stations.

Mr. DAVIS. I will state to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COYLE] that that situation undoubtedly existed to a very great extent. Under the reallocation made pursuant to the equalization amendment, the commission claimed to have undertaken to get away from that situation, and, I think, perhaps, on the whole they have, but in some respects I do not think they have. It is not merely other stations on the same channel that are affected by high power. Anybody familiar with the situation knows that the superpower station not only destroys the reception of any other station on the same wave length, but plays havoc with stations on adjoining wave lengths and frequently on wave lengths with a much greater kilocycle separation.

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS. I yield.

Mr. COLE. Is that superpower necessary?

Mr. DAVIS. No. My opinion and the opinion of many others, including some of the members of the Radio Commission, is that it is not only not necessary but not really beneficial, for the reason that fading takes place with somewhere between five and ten thousand watts power, and after fading takes place, any increase in power is practically worthless for that station, but causes untold damage to the reception of other stations anywhere near it or on a wave length anywhere near that wave length. Certainly chain stations should have neither cleared channels nor superpower. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I am on this committee, and I am supporting this bill, but I am doing it with considerable misgivings. I am supporting it because it is the best thing we can get at this particular time. I have never been very much in favor of this character of legislation, because I thought when we first started out that there would be a few groups in the United States that would undertake to control the air, and that is the situation we have in this country to-day. There are two or three groups which are controlling the air through the regulation of the laws respecting radio. That is a fact, and there can be no dispute about it. At the present time we have two great broadcasting companies, one the National Broadcasting Co. and the other the Columbia chain. Whenever an independent radio station or an individual or independent group undertake to go in and get a license from the present Radio Commission, it will find, either directly or indirectly, opposition from these two great interests. That is the truth, and we might as well look the thing squarely in the face.

I do not desire to make any attack upon the present personnel of the Radio Commission, but I am not at the present moment or in my present frame of mind going to undertake to defend them. I am going to wait and see what they do. But I tell the House and the country that we have put into the hands of the Radio Commission the greatest power that has ever been given to any body of men in this country—the control of communication in the air. They have set up 40 cleared channels, which is absolutely indefensible. Those cleared channels are to-day used by these two combinations, the National Broadcasting Co. and the Columbia chain and their associated sta-



tions. That is the situation. I want to see the present commission take this thing with a strong grip and undertake to give the country some distribution of these cleared channels. [Applause.]

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. Is there anything in this bill which the gentleman has discovered that in any wise strengthens those two objectionable organizations?

Mr. ABERNETHY. None whatever. This bill, in my judgment, gives the independent man or the independent station more rights to appeal to the court, with one exception, and that exception is that the present commission has the right to find facts, and those facts can not be reviewed by the court unless there has been an abuse of discretion or there is something capricious about decisions they may make.

I have nothing against these large corporations like the National Broadcasting Co. and the Columbia chain. I think they serve a very useful purpose. When we can hear Berlin, London, and great events through national hook-ups I think it is a great thing, but I want to serve notice on the Radio Commission, as a humble member of this committee, that I think they can give these two combinations all they need and at the same time have plenty of cleared channels to take care of the balance of the country. That can be done if they have the nerve and courage to do it. I think we might as well lay down the barrage now and let the present commission understand that is the way Congress feels about it. I am sure we feel that way about it or we never would have passed the Davis amendment, and ever since the adoption of the Davis amendment there has been an effort on the part of certain interests to tear it down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I want to say that the present Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee—and this applies to the Republican membership and the Democratic membership—have worked in harmony, and I believe the committee is seeking to serve the country. I believe we are undertaking to bring about conditions that will be beneficial to the whole country, and this legislation is helpful, but it does not go far enough. I want to reserve the right to make a searching investigation of the Radio Commission, if necessary, in the future to ascertain who is controlling the air, how they are controlling it and what method they are using to control it. While I am supporting this legislation I serve notice upon the present Radio Commission that they must function in the interest of the people or they may expect to hear from Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. KVALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Yes.

Mr. KVALE. Reports have been current throughout the country in the past week or two that there are some mysterious shakeups in the air which may drastically affect some of the stations in the way of reassignment of power and redistribution.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman will find there will be considerable shape-ups all the time. Certain large interests came to Washington some time ago and said to Congress, "Give us a monopoly of the air. It will be for the benefit of the people." They brought our friend Owen Young, and he said he desired an absolute monopoly of the air. Of course he does. The interests he represents have at present a considerable monopoly of the air. If Congress or the Radio Commission should give this monopoly, of course they are going to take it.

Mr. KVALE. This had reference to the basic policies of the commission.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I hope the commission will not do anything that is radical, because as far as I am concerned I am looking at them with one eye askance and watching them with the other. [Applause.]

Mr. LARSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Yes.

Mr. LARSEN. The gentleman spoke of the Davis amendment. Is the Davis amendment being put into effect?

Mr. ABERNETHY. To some extent; yes.

Mr. LARSEN. But not fully.

Mr. ABERNETHY. To some extent only.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COYLE].

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to emphasize a point that has just been made, and that is that very often in the allocations to single stations that are not tied up with a chain, the lack of the proper power allocations to the

individual station causes a great deal of cross talk in the local area that belongs locally to the individual station.

There is, I think, nothing fundamentally wrong with the law itself, delegating this power to the Radio Commission. The fundamental difficulty arises, as is almost always the case, through personnel failure and not through the failure of the law itself.

I have but one broadcasting station in my neighborhood, which serves an area that is about six times as large in population and product as each of several States in this Union, and it is practically impossible for that single radio station to get power that will prevent cross talk from stations in or near the same supposed cleared channel that are as much as 300 miles away and clear outside of that area. This lack of power frequently blocks this station into an area radius of not more than 5 miles from its transmitter, although its natural area has a radius of about 50 miles.

As an excellent case in point, which indicates the failure of the Federal Radio Commission to recognize the repeatedly expressed will of Congress, I would cite a recent hearing before the commission on an application of this station WCBA, "The Voice of the Lehigh Valley," for an increase from 250 watts, its present licensed power, to 500 watts. Although the commission had ample authority to grant this application without any recourse to a hearing, it nevertheless determined to hold a hearing. All the other stations operating on 1,440-kilocycle wave lengths were notified of the hearing. There are four other stations in this Middle Atlantic area operating on the same wave length, and all four stations have at least twice as much power as the Allentown station, which is now dividing time with another Allentown station, WSAN, on the same wave length.

At the hearing, there were no witnesses called by any of the stations notified, to testify in opposition to the request for an increase in power. It was stated under oath that these stations in Allentown serve a population of about 600,000. It is a fact that these stations are the only ones which can locally serve this big area. The importance of the area was clearly explained to the commission. It is the home of the Bach Choir, which annually brings people to Bethlehem from 36 States. This year the music of this choir is to be broadcast from its home station, and the power back of the broadcasting is but 250 watts. In the field of sport, these stations broadcast the historic games between Lehigh and Lafayette, both of which universities are in this area. The largest potato market south of Maine is within 8 miles of the location of these stations. In cement, slate, steel production, and more recently in apples and peaches, this area assumes an immense importance. Three Metropolitan opera stars have been developed in Allentown, live there now, and use this station frequently. Yet the Radio Commission, who might have without a hearing allowed the 500-watt power application, nevertheless saw fit after holding a hearing—at which these and many other facts were produced, and at which no witness was produced by anyone in opposition to the motion—still saw fit to refuse the application. This decision was reached in spite of the fact that it was clearly stated and agreed in by the Radio Commission that the State of Pennsylvania is far under the power allocation allowed by the commission itself, and probably because of the fact that it was a little station merely asking to be equal in power with the other stations on the same wave length.

Station WCBA, in Allentown, was one of the earliest in the field, and the Radio Commission itself has admitted, informally of course, that this early station, which has continuously given satisfactory programs to the people in its area, was just overlooked by the commission in the allocation of wave lengths and power in November of 1928. In no sense was it the fault of the owners and operators of this station. It is a fair example of one of the local stations that has been fairly operated and has been just left out of consideration because it did not belong to one of the nation-wide hook ups.

I want to commend the committee for the legislation which it brings in to-day. It may help to clear up and adjust the inequalities of the past. It should express to the Radio Commission the definite will on the part of Congress that the local stations are not to be disregarded in their anxiety to care for the national chains; and if with this added legislation the commission continues to disregard these local stations, it will be but further evidence of the failure of the human element on the Federal Radio Commission to grasp the good will and good intent of the Congress toward the local stations.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, by inadvertence, on page 7, in section 9, the right of appeal by an applicant who is refused a construction permit is omitted. The manner in which this omission came about was that there was consideration of elimi-



nating construction permits entirely. The committee determined not to eliminate them, but in anticipation of such elimination an appeal from a refusal to grant a construction permit was stricken from the appeals section. Inasmuch as construction permits are applied for and can be granted or refused, the right of appeal from such order ought to lie as well as from every other decision of the commission, and hence I offer this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEHLBACH: Page 7, line 23, after the word "applicant," insert the words "for a construction permit, or."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

Mr. ARENTZ. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I will hold the motion in abeyance, with the permission of the Chair.

Mr. ARENTZ. Under the present ruling of the Radio Commission the State of Nevada has been denied any more than two small stations—one located in Las Vegas, Nev., and one in Reno, located about 450 miles apart. Each one of these stations, in turn, is located some two or three hundred miles from the nearest large town or city. The Federal Radio Commission advises me that, because of the Davis amendment and because of some other language now in the law, it is impossible for them to consider giving a license to two 500-watt stations in the State of Nevada. Surely I am within my rights, and I think the State as well, in demanding that something be done to remedy this situation, and if it is not in the present bill I wonder if it would be possible for the gentleman to offer an amendment that would remedy the situation.

Mr. LEHLBACH. There is nothing in the bill that deals with substantive law at all. The Davis amendment is a provision of substantive law that intends or aims to bring about an equitable distribution of radio facilities in all sections of the country.

Mr. ARENTZ. If the Radio Commission misinterprets the meaning of the Davis amendments, and I have spoken to the gentleman regarding the matter and told him that the Radio Commission has referred me to the Davis amendment, saying it does not cover the matter so they are able to do what I have suggested, is it not possible then to remedy this situation by now making it clear?

Mr. DAVIS. I want to state that it has come within my observation several times that the commission, or some member of the commission or the secretary of the commission, has given as the reason for doing something or for not doing something the "Davis radio equalization amendment," when the reason they gave was absolutely false and their assigning the amendment as a reason was simply a subterfuge. Of course, the equalization amendment, just as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH] stated, was designed to effectuate an equal distribution of radio facilities between the different zones and then a fair and equitable distribution of radio facilities among the different States within a zone, and if this is not done it is simply a failure of administration.

Mr. ARENTZ. Is there not some language that could be inserted to make it plain to the commission that we mean just that?

Mr. LEHLBACH. We can not do that in this bill.

Mr. DAVIS. I do not see how you can make it any clearer. The law itself directs it, and they admit that they have not effected an equal distribution in many instances. They admit this. They admit that some sections and some cities are over-quoted and others underquoted, but in many instances they have not had the courage to put the law into effect. This is the only trouble. The equalization amendment is fair and workable, notwithstanding the propaganda to the contrary.

Mr. ARENTZ. I will say that the people located on the isolated ranches, in the mountains and desert valleys of Nevada, are just as much entitled to hear some of the broadcasting from a Nevada station as people in the cities.

Mr. DAVIS. I agree with the gentleman, and before this provision was adopted many sections of the country had no facilities and could not get facilities, whereas some of them had more facilities than were for their own best interests, because their situation was all cluttered up.

Mr. ARENTZ. We can hear California cities, Salt Lake City, Oregon, and Washington cities, and every other section of the United States, but when we have some local material that we want to hear from two sections of our own State, surely the

State is entitled to hear it, which its people can not do several hundred miles from a 100-watt station.

Mr. DAVIS. I agree with the gentleman 100 per cent.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENTZ. I yield.

Mr. BRIGGS. If it had not been for the Davis amendment Nevada might not have had any station at all. You did not have before.

Mr. ARENTZ. That does not take care of the situation now. Mr. BRIGGS. The Davis amendment has made it possible and the question now is one of administration.

Mr. ARENTZ. I hope the statements that have been made here to-day and put in the RECORD will let the commission understand that Congress means that States like Nevada shall have additional facilities than now permitted.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion for the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New Jersey for the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. LEHLBACH, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### COMPENSATION OF VESSELS FOR TRANSPORTING SEAMEN

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I call up the bill (S. 3249) to amend section 4578 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, respecting compensation of vessels for transporting seamen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This bill is on the Union Calendar, and the House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. MARTIN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for one hour.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill that has been introduced in both Houses and has passed the Senate. It was introduced at the request of the Department of State. It deals with the compensation of vessels which, under the law, are compelled to furnish passage for distressed American seamen from different ports of the world back to the United States.

Under the practice the State Department, through its consular officers, may fix a reasonable rate within certain limits to pay for such transportation of seamen who are stranded.

It has been held that where a seaman is picked up in the open sea after a shipwreck, or where he is stranded in a port where there is no American consul, the State Department is without jurisdiction to fix a reasonable compensation for the ship that brings the distressed seaman home, and the Comptroller General must fix it.

The law also provides that where there is no consul in a foreign port the Comptroller General shall fix the compensation. There is an appropriation known as the appropriation for the relief of distressed American seamen out of which all of these items are paid under the discretion, and under the authority of the State Department, save in these few exceptions. The amount of money involved in transporting seamen and over which the Secretary of State may not exercise discretion does not amount to over \$1,000 a year, but in order to make the practice uniform, in order that the whole matter of repatriating stranded seamen may be in one governmental agency this legislation is desired. I know of no opposition to the measure, and unless some time is desired, I will ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read the bill for amendment, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* (1) That section 4579 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by the acts of July 31, 1894, and June 10, 1921, is hereby repealed; and (2) That section 4578 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by the acts of June 26, 1884, June 19, 1886, July 31, 1894, June 10, 1921, and January 3, 1923, be further amended to read as follows:

"All masters of vessels of the United States and bound to some port of the same are required to take such destitute seamen on board their vessels at the request of consular officers, and to transport them to the port in the United States to which such vessel may be bound, on such terms, not exceeding \$10 for each person for voyages of not more than 30 days and not exceeding \$20 for each person for longer voyages, as may be agreed between the master and the consular officer, when

transportation is by a sailing vessel; and the amount agreed upon between the consular officer and the master of the vessel in each individual case not in excess of the lowest passenger rate of such vessel and not in excess of 2 cents per mile shall in each case constitute the lawful rate for transportation on steam vessels; and said consular officer shall issue certificates for such transportation, which certificates shall be assignable for collection. Every such master who refuses to receive and transport such seamen on the request or order of such consular officer shall be liable to the United States in a penalty of \$100 for each seaman so refused. The certificate of any such consular officer, given under his hand and official seal, shall be presumptive evidence of such refusal in any court of law having jurisdiction for the recovery of the penalty. No master of any vessel shall, however, be obliged to take a greater number than one man to every 100 tons burden of the vessel on any one voyage or to take any seaman having a contagious disease.

"Reasonable compensation, in addition to the allowances provided herein, or any allowance now fixed by law or by regulations now or hereafter established in accordance with section 1752 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, may be paid from general appropriations for the relief and protection of American seamen, when authorized by the Secretary of State, in the following cases:

"First. If any such destitute seaman is so disabled or ill as to be unable to perform duty, the consular officer shall so certify in the certificate of transportation, and such additional compensation shall be paid as the Secretary of State shall deem equitable and proper.

"Second. Whenever distressed or destitute seamen of the United States are transported from foreign ports where there is no consular officer of the United States, or from points on the high seas, to ports of the United States, or from such foreign ports or points on the high seas to a port accessible to a consular officer of the United States who is authorized to assume responsibility on behalf of the Government of the United States for the further relief and repatriation of such seamen, there shall be allowed to the master or owner of such vessel in which they are transported such reasonable compensation as shall be deemed equitable by the Secretary of State."

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MARTIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (S. 3249) to amend section 4578 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, respecting compensation of vessels for transporting seamen, and had directed him to report the same back without amendment with the recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question. The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. LEHLBACH, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to repeal section 4579 and amend section 4578 of the Revised Statutes of the United States respecting compensation of vessels for transporting seamen."

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on April 29, 1930, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 11704. An act to amend the air mail act of February 2, 1925, as amended by the acts of June 3, 1926, and May 17, 1928, further to encourage commercial aviation;

H. R. 7881. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to erect a monument as a memorial to the deceased Indian chiefs and ex-service men of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribes of Indians; and

H. R. 10081. An act to amend the act authorizing the attorney general of the State of California to bring suit in the Court of Claims on behalf of the Indians of California.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, the committee has no further bills to call up at this time.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER] for one hour.

#### THE SENATE EXPORT DEBENTURE AMENDMENT

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing excerpts from public documents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KETCHAM). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am going to discuss with you to-day the highly controverted issue of agricultural export debentures. To-morrow we will commence the consideration of the conference report on the tariff bill. One of the amendments on which there will be a separate vote is the Senate export-debenture plan. I asked for time yesterday to discuss this amendment to-day as I wanted to do so before the Members of the House got into an emotional state of mind over highly controverted matters in the tariff bill. I want to bring to your attention certain economic facts and principles bearing on export debentures or bounties.

The question of farm relief has agitated this country for over 10 years, and whatever agitates the country agitates this body. The farm problem has not only agitated this country but it has agitated every agricultural country in the world.

We have in this country about 350,000,000 acres of land under cultivation. Of this 350,000,000 acres 47,000,000 acres are in cotton, 57,000,000 acres in wheat, and 100,000,000 acres in corn. These three products occupy 204,000,000 acres of land, leaving 146,000,000 acres for other agricultural uses. How to handle this 350,000,000 acres of land in a way profitable to the tillers of the soil is the problem that the Federal Farm Board is attempting to solve in cooperation with the farm organizations and the farmers of the country.

In recent years we have passed many laws to aid agriculture. In fact I do not now recall any proposal sponsored by the national farm organizations that was not enacted into law except the Haugen-McNary equalization fee proposal. Behind this Haugen-McNary proposal were most, if not all, of the great national farm organizations except the National Grange.

We will have before us in a few days a Senate amendment to aid agriculture by the so-called export-debenture plan. An export-debenture plan has been sponsored by the National Grange since 1926. So far as I know no other national farm organization has gone on record as favoring such a plan. Any plan that has the backing of a great national farm organization like the National Grange is entitled to serious, candid, and respectful consideration. The export-debenture plan has been twice indorsed by the United States Senate, first in connection with the agricultural marketing bill last year and later as an amendment to the pending tariff bill.

There is no question about the necessity for aid to agriculture. Arguments to demonstrate that are unnecessary. That is conceded by every group that has ever made a study of the agricultural situation in this country. I have listened to arguments in this body as well as elsewhere in support of the export debenture. Usually a good deal of time is taken up to demonstrate the need for relief to agriculture. In some indefinite way it is pointed out that the export debenture will give that relief. Then the conclusion is reached that the export debenture should be enacted into law. Whether this export-debenture plan will aid agriculture is the subject of our inquiry this afternoon.

It is argued that the export-debenture plan will make the tariff effective on agricultural products to which the debenture will be made to apply by the Farm Board. The Senate amendment proposes the issuance of debenture certificates on all agricultural products exported equal to one-half of the duties on such products. Cotton, on which there is no import duty, is to have export-debenture certificates of 2 cents per pound on the cotton exported.

What constitutes making a tariff effective? There are two concepts of an effective tariff. The first is that it increases the domestic price of the commodity over the world price to the extent of the duty on such commodity. That is the concept that is usually in the minds of those who argue for making the tariff effective. That is the concept that was emphasized during the discussions while the Haugen-McNary equalization fee bills were before the Congress and the country. According to this concept to make the tariff effective is to elevate the domestic price over the world price of such commodity by means of a tariff.

The other concept of an effective tariff, which I think is the historic concept, is to bring about a condition by the regulation of foreign commerce by means of tariff barriers that will give to the domestic producers all of the home market which such producers can supply. Or, as is sometimes stated, to give the domestic producers certain advantages over the foreign producers in the home market. There are a number of factors that enter into the determination of the price a commodity will sell for in the domestic market aside from the tariff factor. According to this latter concept of what constitutes an effective tariff the price of a commodity may or may not be elevated if



the domestic producers are given all of the home market. Whether a tariff thus effective will elevate prices depends on competition among domestic producers, domestic marketing conditions, and production of surpluses for export.

In my speech of December 20 last I discussed the effect of the tariff on numerous agricultural products. In the production of all agricultural products there is keen competition. Whether a tariff on agricultural products which gives the domestic producers all the home market will result in an elevation of prices depends very largely on whether or not there are exportable surpluses.

To date the marketing machinery for agricultural products has not been sufficiently developed to prevent the surpluses from depressing the prices to the level of the world prices. Whether the present agricultural marketing act will develop agricultural cooperative organizations or agricultural stabilization corporations with sufficient bargaining power to hold agricultural products above world prices remains to be demonstrated.

Instances can be cited where industrial products were taken from the free list and protected, or the duties on such products were increased, with the result that the prices of the industrial products were cheaper after the protective duties were imposed. Protecting such products has given producers an opportunity for mass production and improved merchandising methods which resulted in lowering the prices of such products. The idea of the old school protectionists was to bring about that very situation.

I do not wish to be understood as claiming that the imposition of duties on industrial products results as a rule in reducing prices. On the other hand, I think the converse is the rule. Producers of industrial products are organized as the producers of agricultural products are not. Producers of industrial products can control their production as the producers of agricultural products can not. The producers of industrial products by organization and control of output can protect themselves against world prices as the producers of agricultural products can not.

I have listened to most of the discussion on the export debenture plan in this body and have also heard discussions elsewhere. Furthermore, I have read a great deal of the literature on the subject that has come to my desk. The supporters of the export debenture cite in support of this plan two great authorities. One, the Report on Manufactures by Alexander Hamilton, and the other a recent report of an informal committee set up by the Right Hon. S. M. Bruce, Prime Minister of Australia, in the spring of 1927. I have in my hand a volume entitled "Industrial and Commercial Correspondence of Alexander Hamilton." Beginning on page 247 of this volume is the report of Mr. Hamilton on the subject of manufactures. I do not know how many of you have ever read this report, but I am sure you have all heard of it. While Mr. Hamilton was Secretary of the Treasury, the House of Representatives ordered him to report on the different means to aid manufactures. The result was the famous Hamilton report on the subject of manufactures. I will read to you the 6-line introduction to this report:

The Secretary of the Treasury, in obedience to the order of the House of Representatives, of the 15th day of January, 1790, has applied his attention, at as early a period as his other duties would permit, to the subject of manufactures; and particularly to the means of promoting such as will tend to render the United States independent of foreign nations for military and other essential supplies.

Those of you who have read this report and are familiar with the literature on the tariff and other aids to manufactures and agriculture, I am sure will agree with me that there never was a more thorough, exhaustive, and intelligent discussion of the subject than that contributed by Alexander Hamilton in this report.

On page 289 Mr. Hamilton gives 11 different ways to aid manufactures, and aids to agriculture are included. There is some discussion following each of the 11 proposed aids. Now, here are the 11 different suggestions or proposals or aids by Mr. Hamilton:

1. Protecting duties, or duties on those foreign articles which are the rivals of the domestic ones intended to be encouraged.
2. Prohibitions of rival articles, or duties equivalent to prohibitions.

That is the same as an embargo tariff. We have some now, and I think there have always been some in the different tariff laws.

3. Prohibitions of the exportation of materials of manufactures.
4. Pecuniary bounties.

I shall return to this in a moment, because it is here that Hamilton has been quoted as favoring the debenture plan proposed in the Senate amendment.

5. Premiums.
6. The exemption of the materials of manufactures from duty.
7. Drawbacks of the duties which are imposed on the materials of manufactures.

We have the drawback in our tariff law.

8. The encouragement of new inventions and discoveries at home and of the introduction into the United States of such as may have been made in other countries, particularly those which relate to machinery.

9. Judicious regulations for the inspection of manufactured commodities.

10. The facilitating of pecuniary remittances from place to place.

11. The facilitating of the transportation of commodities.

Under this last head Mr. Hamilton discusses the improvement of roads and waterways. This report was written before there were railways. The Committee on Rivers and Harbors could get some good pointers out of this part of the report.

Now, turning back to the fourth suggestion, Pecuniary bounties, I want to say before I read from Mr. Hamilton that as an aid to industry and agriculture bounties have their place. I may suggest before I get through different items in the tariff bill where we ought to apply the principle of the bounty instead of the principle of the protective duty.

I am going to warn you now that this address may prove to be somewhat tedious, as I intend to do considerable reading from the authorities before me. I am now going to read several paragraphs under the head of "Pecuniary Bounties" to ascertain whether anything Hamilton had to say on bounties can be construed as supporting the export-debenture plan of the Senate and on which we will have to pass judgment within a few days. I will now read on page 291 the paragraphs that have been quoted as supporting export debentures. I read:

Bounties are sometimes not only the best but the only proper expedient for uniting the encouragement of a new object of agriculture with that of a new object of manufacture. It is the interest of the farmer to have the production of the raw material promoted by counteracting the interference of the foreign material of the same kind. It is the interest of the manufacturer to have the material abundant and cheap. If prior to the domestic production of the material, in sufficient quantity to supply the manufacturer on good terms, a duty be laid upon the importation of it from abroad, with a view to promote the raising of it at home, the interest both of the farmer and manufacturer will be disserved. By either destroying the requisite supply, or raising the price of the article beyond what can be afforded to be given for it by the conductor of an infant manufacture, it is abandoned or fails, and there being no domestic manufactories to create a demand for the raw material, which is raised by the farmer, it is in vain that the competition of the like foreign article may have been destroyed.

It can not escape notice, that a duty upon the importation of an article can no otherwise aid the domestic production of it, than by giving the latter greater advantages in the home market. It can have no influence upon the advantageous sale of the article produced in foreign markets—no tendency, therefore, to promote its exportation.

The true way to conciliate these two interests is to lay a duty on foreign manufactures of the material, the growth of which is desired to be encouraged, and to apply the produce of that duty, by way of bounty, either upon the production of the material itself, or upon its manufacture at home, or upon both. In this disposition of the thing, the manufacturer commences his enterprise under every advantage which is attainable, as to quantity or price of the raw material; and the farmer, if the bounty be immediately to him, is enabled by it to enter into a successful competition with the foreign material. If the bounty be to the manufacturer, on so much of the domestic material as he consumes, the operation is nearly the same; he has a motive of interest to prefer the domestic commodity, if of equal quality, even at a higher price than the foreign, so long as the difference of price is anything short of the bounty which is allowed upon the article.

What Mr. Hamilton was trying to bring about was the establishment of industries and the production of raw materials on the farms to supply such industries. To encourage the farmers to produce the raw materials he suggested a bounty to be paid to them. There is nothing in this entire discussion from which it can be inferred that Hamilton advocated a bounty on farm products of which there were produced a surplus for export. Hamilton has been quoted time and again in both Houses of Congress and by advocates of the export debenture outside of Congress as a supporter of the export-debenture plan. Mr. Hamilton did advocate bounties as an aid to both indus-

try and agriculture under certain circumstances. He did advocate bounties for new undertakings, and for such undertakings on the next page he said:

They are as justifiable as they are oftentimes necessary.

Now, I want to be clearly understood before I go further in this discussion. I do not want you to infer that just because Hamilton was not in favor of a bounty on agricultural products, of which we have a surplus for export, that that proves an export bounty can not or should not ever be used as a means of aiding agricultural products of which we produce a surplus for export. My only purpose in referring to this Hamilton report is to show you that Hamilton advocated protective duties to aid industry and agriculture, and bounties to aid new undertakings of industry and agriculture, and that in so far as this report goes he did not advocate bounties on old and well established undertakings of either industry or of agriculture. Following the discussion of these various aids to industry, Hamilton discusses the situation relative to various products. He takes up the following products: Iron, copper, lead, fossil coal, wood, skins, grain, flax, hemp, and so forth. The discussion of flax and hemp you will find on pages 309 and 310. Under flax and hemp he advocates both a duty and a bounty. In those days they had sailboats and they had to have sailcloth. To have sailcloth was important for navigation, and to have a supply of sailcloth on hand was important for both times of peace and times of war. From the last paragraph on this subject of flax and hemp I read on page 310:

To afford more effectual encouragement to the manufacture, and at the same time to promote the cheapness of the article for the benefit of navigation, it will be of great use to allow a bounty of 2 cents per yard on all sailcloth which is made in the United States from materials of their own growth. This would also assist the culture of those materials. An encouragement of this kind, if adopted, ought to be established for a moderate term of years to invite new undertakings and to an extension of the old. This is an article of importance enough to warrant the employment of extraordinary means in its favor.

I shall quote no further from Mr. Hamilton. What I have quoted to you will give you an understanding of the use of bounties to aid industry and agriculture as contemplated in Mr. Hamilton's report.

I hold in my hand the report of an informal committee set-up by the Right Hon. S. M. Bruce, Prime Minister of Australia, in the spring of 1927. This report was made some time last year. The committee was composed of a professor of economics, a professor of commerce, a member of the stock exchange, and two statisticians. It is a very complete and exhaustive report. The report discusses protective duties and bounties as applicable to the Australian industrial situation. Last fall I heard paragraph 197, beginning on page 109 of this report, quoted in support of the export debenture and afterwards I saw this paragraph in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This committee, like Hamilton, urged the use of bounties instead of protective duties for new undertakings and for industries in their early and experimental stages. The views of Hamilton and of this committee on the uses to be made of bounties seem to be in accord. For nascent industries the committee, in paragraph 197, sums up the advantages of bounties over protective duties. Reading this paragraph alone one might get the idea that the committee sought to displace all protective duties with bounties in all cases. Now, bear in mind that the committee advocates the use of bounties instead of protective duties to aid industries in their early and experimental stages, and with that in mind I will read to you paragraph 197, on the advantages and practicability of bounties. I read:

From every point of view, except that of political expediency, bounties are to be preferred to customs duties as a means of protection, and we may summarize their advantages as follows:

1. The assistance given to a tariff-protected industry is, in fact, a bounty, but it is paid by consumers, and much of its cost falls ultimately on the export industries.
2. Bounties paid from tax revenues are paid by the general taxpayer, who can be taxed in proportion to his income and capacity with much less hampering effect on production.
3. Bounties do not raise prices except through the general influence of taxation.
4. Bounties require payments only on the goods produced locally, while duties require payments on all the goods consumed, through the customs duties collected on the imports, which continue.
5. With bounties it is easy to discriminate between the grades of goods which can be produced at home and those which can not, and to leave the latter free from taxation.

6. The cost of bounties is definitely known and felt; it is not obscured as with duties, and there is a natural and healthy resistance to and criticism of the assistance given.

7. There is less probability of wasteful assistance to industries of minor importance.

Now, let me read to you a part of paragraph 200, beginning at the bottom of page 110:

We suggest, notwithstanding the fact that a general adoption of the bounty system is quite impracticable, that it should be possible in many cases to begin with bounties while home production is small. When the industry has grown and justified a continuance of protection, the practical necessities of the Treasury may make it advisable to substitute a protective duty. In the early stages of any industry, before it can develop its production, a duty increases the cost to the community without compensating benefit, except in respect of the revenue derived.

What I have just read to you is absolutely true. It applies to our situation in this country as it applies to the situation in Australia. Bounties can be used to-day to encourage new undertakings both here and in Australia, as they could have been used during the early period of our country when Mr. Hamilton made his report. Bounties have their advantages and practicability to-day as well as 140 years ago. One other quotation from this report in the introduction, on page 8, under the heading, "Bounties," I read:

Bounties are more economical than protective duties and are preferable on all grounds except financial expediency. They should be adopted as the method of protection when the industry is in an early and experimental stage. If and when the industry is established, a tariff duty could be substituted, and the amount necessary more accurately determined. We suggest the establishment of a trust fund for bounties, into which a fixed proportion of the customs revenue should be paid.

Here, as in other places in the report, the committee advocates a trust fund to be fed by customs duties and to be administered so as to aid industries in their early and experimental stages.

I realize that there is a prejudice aroused in this country at the mere suggestion of a bounty. There are numerous products of both industry and agriculture that should be protected by bounties rather than by customs duties. Hamilton advocated the use of bounties for new undertakings. The Australian committee advocates the use of bounties to aid industries in their early and experimental stages. Now, in this country when protection to a new undertaking is suggested we think only of customs duties.

In the pending tariff bill we double the duty on filberts. You know the filbert is a cultivated hazel nut. The present duty is 2½ cents per pound. The bill carries 5 cents per pound. Filberts are raised chiefly in Oregon. In 1928 we consumed 12,000 tons of filberts. That same year Oregon placed on the market 100 tons of filberts. This is a new undertaking. This is a nascent industry. It is an industry in its early and experimental stage. I am told if all the filbert orchards which are now planted and those that are in prospect to be planted come into full bearing we will produce 1,000 or 2,000 tons of filberts. There is no question but that doubling the duty on filberts will add that much additional burden on consumers of filberts. A bounty on filberts would be the economically sound way to aid this industry.

In California there is an olive-oil industry which produces about 1 per cent of our consumption of olive oil. This bill increases the duty on olive oil. The increase in duty is not going to increase the production of olive oil in this country. This nascent olive-oil industry should be protected, if at all, by a bounty.

In the State of Washington they are trying to grow tulip bulbs. This, too, is an industry in its early and experimental stage. For years we have imported our tulip bulbs from Holland. The peculiar climate of that country and the skill of generations in cultivating tulip bulbs produce a tulip bulb the like of which can not be gotten from any other place in the world. The State of Washington claims to have the climate and soil to produce tulip bulbs. Last year we imported 76,000,000 tulip bulbs. The State of Washington produced about 1,500,000 tulip bulbs. Experts who ought to know claim that the Washington tulip bulb is not comparable to the Holland tulip bulb. They also state that the cultivators of tulips in this country must have the Holland bulbs because of their superior quality. A leading nurseryman and cultivator of flowers informs me that the Washington tulip bulbs can be sold only in the 10-cent stores. I think the Washington tulip-bulb industry should have protection. That industry should be given every possible chance to demonstrate that the tulip bulbs can be pro-



duced in this country. The way to help that nascent industry is by means of a bounty and not by greatly increasing the duty as the present tariff bill contemplates.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. If it is on the export debenture I will yield. If it is on tulip bulbs I would prefer to proceed with my remarks. I am simply attempting to illustrate where bounties are applicable in the scheme of protection and where duties are applicable in the scheme of protection.

In the case of nuts or tulip bulbs, if, after being helped along by bounties the industry gets to the place where it can supply a considerable portion of our demand and of the quality that we require, then is the time to withdraw the bounty and apply a duty for the purpose of protection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield for a short statement?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Not for a statement. I yield for a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does the gentleman think that we should advertise the Washington tulip as only being sold in the 10-cent store? Do not the people seem to like the word "imported"? We might grant a bounty of double the selling price of the home-grown tulip and still people would ask for something that was imported. It seems to be human nature. It is the local article that is always bad and the imported article that is always fine. It is a trick of the trade in salesmanship to use the word "imported" in order to get the fancy price.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Perhaps that is true, but that does not argue against the advantages of bounties to aid new undertakings.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I yield.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Do I understand that it is the gentleman's idea that it was the idea of Hamilton and the Australian report to have a bounty when and only when there was not enough of the commodity produced for domestic consumption?

Mr. RAMSEYER. It is the Hamilton idea and it is the idea of the special committee on the tariff which was appointed by the Prime Minister of Australia to make use of the bounty for new undertakings.

Mr. KINCHELOE. The trouble with agriculture to-day is not that we do not raise enough for domestic consumption but that we raise too much, and therefore under such a state of the case would not the report to which the gentleman has referred and the opinion given by Hamilton be against a bounty now?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I think the gentleman's conclusion is correct. I have already stated there is nothing in the Hamilton report on manufactures which supports an export debenture such as is provided for in the Senate amendment, and there is nothing in this Australian report which in any way supports the idea that an export debenture such as appears in the Senate amendment should be adopted. Let me state again that I did not bring in the Hamilton report and the Australian report for the purpose of conveying the idea that because these reports are against the export debenture that that is conclusive proof that we ought to be against it. These two reports have been repeatedly cited as favoring the export-debenture plan. Such a conclusion can not be supported by a careful reading of these reports.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I want to ask the gentleman if he found anything in that report which offered any way of restoring equality to the surplus-producing farmer after he had reached the point where they claimed the bounty should not apply?

Mr. RAMSEYER. These reports state that when the industry has reached a certain stage of development the bounty should be withdrawn, and if the industry needs or deserves protection, for the public good it should receive its protection through a duty.

Mr. JONES of Texas. How would the raw-material production receive any protection if it were on a surplus-producing basis?

Mr. RAMSEYER. For the present I concede it will not by duties alone. The reports do not discuss a situation like that.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Then, as the gentleman conceives it, the theory of that report is that agriculture should simply be a handmaid of industry and that after it produces what industry needs it ought to quit?

Mr. RAMSEYER. No; that is not the deduction at all.

Mr. JONES of Texas. What is the deduction?

Mr. RAMSEYER. The only deduction I make, after quoting from these two authorities—and I have read them through and have only quoted briefly—is that they can not be cited as sup-

porting the export debenture plan as set out in the Senate amendment in the tariff bill. That is all.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I concede the gentleman has a right to his opinion. But I do not agree with all his conclusions as to the Hamilton report.

Mr. RAMSEYER. If the gentleman will take the time to give the Hamilton report a careful and intelligent study—and he is capable to do that—he will arrive at exactly the same conclusion that I have just stated.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. For a question.

Mr. RANKIN. As I understand the gentleman's argument it is that it was Hamilton's idea to pay this bounty whenever it was unprofitable to produce these agricultural commodities in order to encourage their production. Now, when they are not produced profitably because of the high prices of industrial articles does not the gentleman think his logic would apply to the payment of an export debenture in order to make it profitable to produce agricultural commodities?

Mr. RAMSEYER. No; nothing in Hamilton's report nor anything I have said about the report justifies either the statement or the question which the gentleman from Mississippi has submitted. I hope the gentleman will read the report, and if he can find anything in the report which supports even remotely the idea of an export debenture on a product of which we produce a surplus for export I should like to know it.

Mr. CHRISTGAU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. CHRISTGAU. Is the gentleman going to discuss the export tariff bounty such as they have in Australia?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Export bounties on a limited scale are used in a number of countries, and I intend to make some reference to them and show how their operation differs from the plan under consideration. I was going to take first the bill and analyze the Senate amendment, but since the gentleman raises that question I will now go to a discussion of some of the aids that other countries give to agriculture.

First, let us get into our minds just what the theory of the export debenture is, and how it is supposed to aid agriculture. The object of the Senate export-debenture plan is to elevate the prices of farm commodities of which we produce a surplus for export. The proposal in the amendment is to offer a bounty to the exporter equal to half of the duty. To illustrate, let us take wheat. The duty is 42 cents per bushel and the bounty would be 21 cents. The exporter would be given a debenture certificate of 21 cents for each bushel of wheat exported, which could be used in paying the duties on any and all imports.

Now, the theory is that when the debenture plan is in effect the exporter, knowing he is going to get this debenture of 21 cents a bushel, will bid that much more per bushel, or nearly that much more, for the wheat which he buys for export, and as he will be in the market continuously to buy wheat for export just as fast as he can find buyers abroad, the domestic buyers of wheat for milling and other purposes will have to bid up or nearly up to the amount the exporter bids, and that will have a tendency to elevate the price of wheat throughout the country, just how much no one undertakes to say. They argue it may vary in effectiveness as the tariff does. The tariff on some products is effective to the full extent, on others products it is only partially effective, and on still other products it is not effective at all. There are a number of factors that must be taken into consideration.

So an export bounty on wheat under certain conditions may be fully effective, under other conditions only partially effective, and under still other conditions may not be effective at all, and even may do actual damage.

As far as I know, no country in the world has now an export bounty of the nature that is proposed in the Senate amendment. Germany has had export bounties for a number of years before the war. Of course, during the war they did not operate or the laws were repealed. Germany went back to export bounties in 1925.

I have here a report of the Tariff Commission on "Bounties in Foreign Countries on Production and Exportation." You will find on page 21 a brief statement on the bounty certificates on exports of grain used in Germany. The German exporters of rye, wheat, spelt, barley, oats, buckwheat, legumes, as well as flour and malt and other mill products, receive a certificate for a sum equal to the import duties on a corresponding quantity of cereals or legumes.

These certificates can be used in the payment of import duties on any of the articles above named.

Now, note that the export certificates which the exporters receive on wheat and other products I just named can be used only to pay import duties of a like amount of cereals and legumes. What useful purpose does this arrangement serve in

Germany? Eastern and northeastern Germany are agricultural. There they raise wheat more than they do in western and southern Germany where the dense industrial populations reside. Germany in the last five years has exported each year about 12,000,000 bushels of wheat and has imported nearly 90,000,000 bushels of wheat, so you see Germany must import a great deal more than she exports.

The wheat raised in eastern and northeastern Germany is a wheat of low protein content. They have to import the wheat of higher protein content from other countries.

There are two reasons why Germany has this export bounty certificate plan. One is to get rid of her low-grade wheat and with the certificates import the high-grade wheat, and the other is, that northeastern and eastern Germany are near the sea and the sea freight rates to the countries where their markets are, are a good deal less than the rail rates from eastern Germany to western and southern Germany, where the dense industrial populations reside.

Lately, in 1928, Germany amended the bounty-certificate system to include hogs, pork, and ham, and these certificates can be used to import duty free the cereals heretofore named.

Sweden has an export-bounty plan, but there it is used, so I have read and also have been told, to prevent seasonal gluts; that is, to get rid of grain they issue export certificates at a certain season of the year and then the export certificates are used at another time of the year to bring in grain. These and other countries have this plan of issuing bounty certificates on exports to aid agriculture, and also to balance, in a way, their needs.

Germany has a high duty on wheat to protect her farmers. That duty has been raised recently. Last July the wheat duty was raised from 32 to 42 cents per bushel, January 20 last the duty was raised to 62 cents, March 27 it was raised to 78 cents per bushel. Recently another increase was announced raising the wheat duty to 97 cents per bushel, effective the 25th of this month.

Germany aids her wheat growers in still another way—by requiring a certain portion of the wheat used by millers to be German-grown. Year before last it was 40 per cent and last year, by order or law, the millers must use 50 per cent of wheat grown in Germany.

I have been unable to find in any country—and this report discusses bounties in 24 countries—any plan that is so broad in its scope as the plan that is before us. In nearly every country where they use this plan it is used like it is in Germany; that is, first, to aid agriculture and then to balance or to help to balance their needs. One way to help balance their needs is to get rid of the kind of products they do not need and get in the kind of products which they do need.

Mr. BRIGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. For a question, yes.

Mr. BRIGHAM. Are all the countries that use the export bounty on a net import basis of the product upon which it is levied?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I do not quite get the question.

Mr. BRIGHAM. Germany is on a net-import basis as to wheat.

Mr. RAMSEYER. She imports 90,000,000 bushels and exports 12,000,000 bushels, her surplus of imports over exports being 78,000,000 bushels.

Mr. BRIGHAM. So she is on a net-import basis?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. BRIGHAM. Are all the countries that are using the bounty plan on a net-import basis with reference to the products upon which a bounty is paid?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I can not answer that question.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. JONES of Texas. For what year is the gentleman quoting figures with respect to the importations and exportations of Germany?

Mr. RAMSEYER. This report of the Tariff Commission was made in October, 1929. The last tariff duty on wheat went into effect April 25 in Germany. I received that information yesterday from the farm-marketing experts in the Department of Agriculture. I also received the figures of German imports and exports of wheat from the same source and the figures apply to the last five crop years.

Mr. HOPE. Will the gentleman yield before he leaves that question?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. HOPE. I understood the gentleman to say that export debentures as issued in Germany could only be used in paying the duty on bread products.

Mr. RAMSEYER. On the grains which I named, yes.

Mr. HOPE. Are there any debentures issued which may be used in payment of duties on imports generally?

Mr. RAMSEYER. If there are, I have never heard of them. In Germany the export bounty certificates are used, as I have stated, both to help the farmers and to balance the needs of the nation. Of course, Germany's situation is entirely different from ours with respect to the products sought to be benefited by the export bounty. We import little or none of the products we want to aid by the debenture. In Germany more of wheat is imported than exported. With us much wheat is exported and very little imported.

Mr. HOPE. If the gentleman will permit another question along the same line, there is a provision in the Senate tariff bill which makes it optional with the board as to whether or not the debenture plan shall be put into effect. Do any of the other countries which the gentleman has mentioned have this same provision or is the provision a part of their substantive law?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I have not read any of the acts of any of the countries whose systems I am discussing. I received my information from reports, and I do not recall any reference made to optional provisions. The optional provision in the Senate amendment I think is one that is very objectionable. If an export bounty were put into effect for a definite time, or if a bounty of any kind were put into effect for a definite time, say 3 years, 5 years, or 10 years, then the producers as well as those who deal in that commodity, would know just what to expect.

But here is a plan that can be placed in operation by a board on a day's notice. In practice I do not suppose that the board would put it into effect that soon. Any bounty, whether it is an export bounty or any other kind of bounty, to be helpful at all should have the element of definiteness of time connected with it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I will yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The discussion has been very interesting from an academic standpoint. Does the gentleman propose to point out some method by which the tariff may be made effective on our surplus agricultural crops?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I have discussed the tariff bill and its effects on agricultural products in former addresses, and the gentleman can get my views on that in a speech that I delivered here on December 20 last. To-day I am addressing myself to this particular proposition that will be before the House this week.

The question for us to determine is whether this particular plan will be of aid and benefit to agriculture, and if we decide it will aid whether we should enact it into law at this time.

I am sure that I express the sentiment of every Member of this House when I say that we want to do all that we can to foster a prosperous agriculture.

Now, the only thing before us to-day is, and the only thing that we can consider, on the tariff bill is the Senate export debenture amendment—to consider other plans during this discussion would be purely academic—so let us center our thoughts on this in order to determine whether or not this particular plan will tend to aid the agricultural situation in this country, which everybody here concedes ought to get aid.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does not the gentleman think that practically he is entirely begging the question as far as any relief to the farmer is concerned, on the theory that the tariff is not effective on the surplus. What benefit does it do the farmer to say "Here is the only proposition we have and that this is not effective"?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I am telling the gentleman that the only proposition before us is the Senate debenture plan. This we should face squarely. To discuss other plans would be "begging the question." If he will let me proceed a while longer, we may be able to determine whether this particular proposition will aid agriculture, and whether we want to indorse it. We can not substitute other propositions as the gentleman well knows, because he is familiar with the rules of the House; you can not offer an amendment to this Senate amendment that is not germane or not within the limits of the controversy which marks the difference between the two Houses.

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. Before the gentleman leaves the matter of applying the bounty, take the price of wheat, which has varied in the last 10 years from 75 cents a bushel to close up to \$4 a bushel. Might it not be wise to have an optional application of the law? You would not want to apply it when wheat was \$4 a bushel, but you would want to apply it when it was 75 cents a bushel.



Mr. RAMSEYER. Does the gentleman claim that is written in the Senate amendment?

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. That is in it the way it is now.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Making the operation of the debenture optional with the board, there is nothing in this Senate amendment to prevent the board from applying the debenture when wheat is \$4 a bushel and refusing to apply it when wheat is 75 cents per bushel. The gentleman from Ohio was one of the enthusiastic advocates of the McNary-Haugen bill with the equalization fee in it. I supported that, and probably had as much to do with trying to keep the House straight on the kind of a yardstick to apply to the operation of the equalization fee as anybody.

Speaking of the McNary-Haugen equalization fee bill, we did not leave the determination as to when the operating period should be applied to the judgment or the whim of the board. We wrote into that bill a very specific rule for the guidance of the board in the commencement of and the determination of what was known as the operating period.

In the McNary-Haugen equalization fee bill that was last before the House the yardstick was this—I will see whether I can recall it. We provided that when the domestic price was less than the foreign price plus the tariff, plus the freight rate to the chief competing foreign market, that the board should commence an operating period and apply the equalization fee.

The theory was that the application of the equalization fee would tend to bring the domestic price up to the foreign price, plus the tariff, plus the freight rate. We had a very definite yardstick, and notwithstanding that definite yardstick, the constitutionalists in this body and in the other body claimed that it was unconstitutional.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have 30 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, no one appreciates this address more than I do, and I am not going to object, but if the gentleman takes 30 minutes more, the time that I was to have at the close of all of the other addresses will be eliminated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this very much. I did not come to you with a prepared address, as I sometimes do on highly controverted subjects. I have given this subject some study and I have a great deal of material on it before me. If I can do so, I want to throw light on this very complicated and highly controverted proposition. I stated yesterday in seeking this time that I hoped that we could conduct something in the nature of a round table and exchange views in a somewhat informal way. In the matter of the equalization fee we had a definite yardstick, as I said, directing the board when to operate and requiring the board to specify the time during which the equalization fee shall remain in effect. The question of the delegation of legislative power to an officer or a board is often brought in issue in this body. Some constitutionalists in Congress in both bodies claimed that the equalization fee provision was unconstitutional on the ground that it was a delegation of legislative power. The House Agricultural Committee undertook to so frame the equalization fee provision as to make it free from the objection of being a delegation of legislative power.

I come now to the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment provides that whenever the board finds it advisable, in order to carry out the policy declared in section 1 of the agricultural marketing act, with respect to any agricultural commodity, to issue export debentures with respect to such commodity, said board shall give notice of such finding to the Secretary of the Treasury. Then the Secretary proceeds to issue debentures to exporters as the law would require of him.

There was no question in my mind that in the McNary-Haugen bill with the equalization fee in it we were required to have a definite yardstick or rule to govern the boards' action in order to pass muster of the courts. I am not going to discuss the constitutional issue that is inherent in this provision, but if in the McNary-Haugen equalization fee bill we were required to write in a definite yardstick to direct the board in its activities, I suggest this question: Why is it not necessary in this bill where we empower the board to divert customs duties from their regular course to the Treasury to have in it a definite yardstick, ascertainable, so as to free this provision from the objection of being a delegation of legislative power? The amendment on page 327 of the bill, lines 15 and 16, reads:

In order to carry out the policy declared in section 1 of said agricultural marketing act.

Section 1 of the agricultural marketing act is a declaration of policy. Just what a declaration of policy adds to or subtracts from the rest of the law which defines the duties and powers of the board at this time I am not going to discuss. I merely want to suggest that the declaration of policy may aid the courts in determining what Congress had in mind in giving certain powers to the board. The declaration of policy does not confer powers. For the powers and duties of the board one must look to that part of the law outside of section 1. I do not regard section 1 as a rule or yardstick or imposing on the board the duty to find certain facts or the existence of certain situations on which the board is required to act in commencing an operating period. All the direction that the board is given on which to base its action to commence an operating period is the declaration of policy in section 1 of the agricultural marketing act. Even though it should be found that section 1 does lay down a definite rule for the guidance of the board under the provision of the amendment the board need not act on its finding of the existence of a certain state of facts, but it may find the facts for an operating period and then decide for reason or no reason that it is not advisable. In other words, the amendment reposes in the board arbitrary powers to divert customs revenue from the Treasury. That, in my opinion, is a delegation of legislative powers.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. For a question.

Mr. RANKIN. Does not the gentleman think that the yardstick is fixed here as one-half of the tariff on the commodity, for the benefit of which the debenture is levied?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Oh, no; that is a definite direction after the board directs the commencement of an operating period.

The yardstick is used in determining the commencement of the operating period. The board does not fix the amount of the debenture. If the board finds it advisable to commence an operating period on any agricultural commodity, the Secretary of the Treasury must issue debentures to the amount of 50 per cent of the import duty on such commodity. The board nor the Secretary has any power or discretion to make the debenture anything else than 50 per cent of the import duty.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly, and that is the debenture yardstick, just as the full tariff was the yardstick in the McNary-Haugen bill.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Oh, no; nothing like it. We had a declaration of policy in the McNary-Haugen bill in section 1:

It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to promote orderly marketing—

And so forth.

If, a little further on, we had said that the board, whenever it deems it advisable to carry out the policy declared in section 1 of the bill, shall do so—and so, we would have something analogous to this; but in trying to give the board a yardstick under the old McNary-Haugen bill we did not rely on the declaration of policy. We gave the board something definite, which was not referred to at all in the declaration of policy.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman now is going off on the constitutional angle.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I am through with the constitutional phase, if the gentleman will permit me to go to another phase. I am simply suggesting the constitutional element. I am not going to argue it a bit further. If I were to undertake to discuss the constitutional phase of it, I would have to ask you not for 30 minutes more time, which was so courteously granted me a moment ago, but for a great deal more time.

Now, if the gentleman from Mississippi will desist, I will say no more about the Constitution.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not propose to discuss that phase of it, but the fact is that we declared the tariff to be the yardstick in the McNary-Haugen bill, just as is suggested here.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The gentleman repeats and reiterates his assertion, but that does not change the facts. I have at different times discussed the constitutional phases of the McNary-Haugen bill, and, so far as I know, I was the only one who ever undertook to defend the constitutionality of the equalization fee on the floor of this House. There were a number of gentlemen who spoke against the constitutionality of the equalization fee in the McNary-Haugen bill.

In the forepart of my address I called attention to the uses that can and should be made of bounties to aid new undertakings. I have tried to make it plain that I do not want to be understood as saying that an export bounty on a surplus crop could under no circumstances serve a beneficial purpose. If Congress wants the export bounty on surplus crops it should designate the agricultural commodities that are to receive this bounty and either make the bounty mandatory or give the board a definite

rule to guide it in declaring an operating period. If the bounty is made mandatory Congress should further specify a definite number of years over which the bounty is to operate. If the bounty is to be placed in operation by the board under a rule prescribed by Congress the board should be required to fix a definite period over which the bounty shall apply. All this is highly essential in order that the producers of such commodities and those who deal in those commodities may know what to expect. Under such circumstances I am inclined to think that an export bounty would tend to elevate the prices of commodities of which we produce a surplus for export. How much the prices would be elevated would depend upon a number of factors outside of the bounty. In making this statement as to the tendency of the bounty to elevate prices I leave out the possibility of increased production and the application of countervailing duties by foreign countries.

Either considerable increased production of an agricultural commodity on which the export bounty operates or the application of countervailing duties by foreign countries would tend to negative any benefit from the bounty on such commodity.

The gentlemen who are most strenuously supporting the export bounty system are opposed to the flexible tariff because it confers too much power upon the President. Under the Senate debenture amendment the board is given the right to apply export bounties on any and all agricultural commodities exported whenever the board finds it advisable to do so. The board is the creature of the President, every member of which can be discharged by the President on a minute's notice. It is assumed by the advocates of the debenture that the board will do whatever the President wants it to do. If that be so, the Senate amendment gives the President the power to divert at will annually \$281,577,175 of customs revenues.

The flexible provision of the tariff law gives the President the power, under specific and ironclad rules laid down by Congress, to raise or lower customs duties within prescribed limits. The President can not exercise this power until the Tariff Commission has made a thorough investigation and reported its findings to him. In my judgment, the Senate debenture proposal confers greater power upon the President than the flexible provision of the tariff law.

I have before me here some calculations respecting export debentures as provided in section 321 of the tariff bill. These tables were prepared by the experts of the Tariff Commission. Therein are specified several hundred agricultural products, and the manufactures thereof, and the debenture cost on each product on the basis of the 1929 exports and of the rates as agreed to by the conference committee as of April 18, 1930. I shall place these tables in the Record.

I also have before me a table of estimated gross and cash income from farm production in the United States for the years 1924 to 1928, prepared by the Department of Agriculture. I shall also place this table in the Record. I was unable to get the income from farm production for the year 1929, as that has not yet been compiled.

Now, let us do some calculating. I assume that the 1929 income figures would not differ materially from the 1928 income figures. The grand total of gross income from all farm products for the year 1928 was \$11,827,709,000. The gross income from cotton lint for the same year was \$1,300,502,000. The gross income from the production of leaf tobacco was \$276,448,000. The gross income from wheat for that year was \$764,621,000. The gross income from farm production of all products except cotton and tobacco was \$10,250,759,000.

Assuming that the Farm Board will apply the debenture to all farm products, let us turn to the debenture tables and see how the Senate proposal will operate. On leaf tobacco the debenture cost will be \$97,197,704. On cotton, unmanufactured, the debenture cost will be \$79,630,190. On all other farm products and manufactures thereof the debenture cost will be \$90,898,922. Wheat is one of the commodities that this debenture is supposed to benefit. On wheat, the gross income of which in 1928 was \$764,621,000, the debenture cost will be \$18,927,216.

Taking these figures and with a little calculating you will ascertain that tobacco will benefit at the expense of the Public Treasury in debenture cost to the extent of 35 per cent of the gross income of leaf tobacco. Cotton will derive from the Public Treasury in debenture cost 6 per cent of the gross income from cotton. Wheat will derive from the Public Treasury by way of debenture cost 2 per cent of the gross income from wheat. All farm products except tobacco and cotton will derive from the Public Treasury by way of debenture cost nine-tenths of 1 per cent of the gross income from all farm products except cotton lint and leaf tobacco.

You gentlemen from the Corn and Wheat Belts who think you must vote for this debenture proposal should take the story of

these calculations home to your people and see what they think about it. This is relief not on a basis of the needs of the various farm commodities, but on a basis of the accidents of tariff rates, except as to cotton where the export bounty is arbitrarily fixed at 2 cents per pound.

A word further here in regard to tobacco. The duty on tobacco is 35 cents per pound. Dark tobacco raised in western Kentucky, western Tennessee, and southern Indiana has been selling during the present season at 12 cents a pound. Eighty per cent of this tobacco is exported. The debenture on tobacco in the Senate amendment is 17½ cents per pound, or 145 per cent of what it has been selling for. A tobacco farmer, or a manager of a tobacco cooperative, or a tobacco exporter could ship this tobacco to a foreign country, give it away, and still have more money in his pocket than he could derive from the domestic selling price. Oh, but somebody will say, with this high-debenture rate the board will never find it advisable to apply the debenture on tobacco. If this becomes a law, is it not the will of Congress that leaf tobacco shall have a debenture of 17½ cents per pound? If tobacco gets in distress, as it has been in times past, why should not the board find it advisable to help out tobacco? The extent of the help that Congress provides for tobacco is none of the board's business. That is the business of Congress. When it becomes advisable to help tobacco it is the business of the board to help in the way and to the extent that Congress declares in the law. I think that the wheat growers should be very happy when they contemplate how much this proposal intends to help tobacco and how little it intends to help wheat.

We have been told, and it has been urged on this floor, that the National Grange is for the debenture proposal before us. It is true the Grange since 1926 has advocated the export debenture. I am of the opinion that the National Grange is not for the proposal before us and that its officials will not defend the Senate amendment on cross-examination before a committee of Congress. If you will listen, I will prove it to you. The National Grange export-debenture plan was incorporated in a bill introduced during the first session of the Seventieth Congress, H. R. 12892, by Mr. KETCHAM, of Michigan. You who have read this bill know that it is a definite proposition—the board given specific directions, required to make findings of facts, and to consider conditions with regard to farm commodities both here and in foreign countries.

The National Grange plan, as incorporated in this bill, specifies seven farm commodities to which the export-debenture rates are prescribed, to wit: (1) Swine; (2) cattle; (3) corn; (4) rice; (5) wheat. On these five commodities the debenture rates prescribed are one-half of the import duties then in effect. The other two commodities are: (6) Cotton, 2 cents per pound; (7) tobacco, 2 cents per pound. Note the difference in the tobacco rate in the Senate amendment and in the National Grange bill. In the former it is 17½ cents per pound; in the latter it is 2 cents per pound. The officers of the National Grange are economists and the rates they advocated were based on economic facts and conditions. Two cents per pound on tobacco sounds reasonable and economic and was recommended to give relief to the tobacco growers. Seventeen and one-half cents per pound sounds unreasonable and uneconomic and inclines one to the belief that the 17½-cent rate was proposed by the tobacco politicians and not by the tobacco growers.

Let me point out another difference in the Senate proposal and the National Grange proposal. Coming to what is known as the penalty provision, on page 332 of the tariff bill beginning with line 4, you will see there is to be no reduction in the debenture rates for an increase in production of less than 20 per cent. You could have a 19 per cent increase and still get the full debenture rate. A 19 per cent increase on wheat would mean increasing the surplus of wheat by at least 160,000,000 bushels. You who know the wheat situation will readily understand what havoc such an increase in production would bring about in the wheat market.

The Senate amendment further provides:

For an increase in production of 40 per cent but less than 60 per cent there shall be a reduction of 50 per cent.

That is a reduction in the debenture rate of 50 per cent.

Now let us look at the penalty provision proposed by the National Grange, which you will find on page 17 of the Ketcham bill. This provides that there shall be no reduction in debenture rates for a computed increase in production or acreage of less than 5 per cent. The Senate provision is 20 per cent. A little further down is this provision:

For a computed increase in production or acreage of 15 per cent or more the issuance of debentures shall be suspended for a period of one year.



According to the National Grange plan, an increase in production or acreage of 15 per cent suspends the debenture. Under the Senate amendment an increase in production of less than 20 per cent does not reduce the export-debenture rates. I will leave it to you to judge which of these two proposals is the more economically sound.

Now I shall proceed to another matter in this round-table discussion.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman, before he closes, discuss section 303 relating to countervailing duties and the effect of that upon the debenture? Is it not true that the debenture proposes to do what in section 303 we forbid all foreign countries to do to us?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I will refer to that before I conclude.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has said the President would have the power to divert \$281,577,175 from the Treasury.

Mr. RAMSEYER. No; from the customs, on the way to the Treasury.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Would the farmers get the benefit of that \$281,577,175?

Mr. RAMSEYER. That depends on many different factors. I am not saying that export bounties could not be used, if rightly administered, in a way to give some benefits to agriculture. To determine the benefits to be derived from an export bounty you have got to study each commodity separately and take into consideration the situation that prevails both here and abroad at the time the debenture is placed in operation. It is difficult to forecast just how it will operate and to what extent benefits will be realized. It presents difficulties of the same nature as is presented in determining how a customs duty will affect the price of a commodity.

A duty may be high enough to exclude all importations, but if you have competition among the producers of any commodity and possibly also the benefits of mass production and improved marketing facilities, the cost of such commodity to the consumer may be less than it was before the exclusion of the foreign commodity. With the export bounty on a surplus farm product you must take into consideration the world's supply and demand of that product. Take wheat; last year there was a large world surplus. If the export bounty had been applied to wheat last year at threshing time and that had resulted in an abnormal acceleration of the flow of wheat to foreign markets, the crash in wheat prices might have come several months sooner than it did and with the possibility of more disastrous results. This question as to benefits to be derived either from bounties or duties can not be answered off-hand. In the tariff bill there are about 23,000 different items. Each item has a story of its own. You can not say that because a duty will benefit item No. 1 that it, therefore, will also benefit item No. 7. Item No. 1 may react to a duty one way this year, a different reaction may have resulted three years ago, and both reactions be different to what the reaction will be five years hence. Item No. 7 may or may not have the same reaction at different times.

A bounty paid directly to the producer will benefit the producer to the extent of the bounty. An export bounty paid to the exporters of surplus products may or may not benefit the producers of those products. There is nothing in the Senate amendment requiring the exporter to exercise diligence in returning as much of the export bounty to the producer as possible.

There is nothing to prevent him from buying surplus products as low as possible and using the bounty which he receives to sell the products in the foreign market below the world price. If Congress deems it wise to try out the export bounty on surplus farm products, it should begin with a limited number of commodities, lay down a definite rule for the guidance of the board, fix the bounties in proportion to the needs of the producers of such products, and then fix a definite period of years for the operation thereof so that the producers and dealers in such commodities will know what to expect and to figure on.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I yield.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman feel that the bounty would be effective on the producers of flaxseed and sugar beets, if applied?

Mr. RAMSEYER. With respect to sugar, I opposed an increased duty on sugar, for the simple reason that I did not think, and I do not think now, that it will result in an expansion of the sugar-raising area, on account of the obstacle of getting

labor to perform that particular kind of work. The domestic production of sugar is one-sixth of our demand. Two-sixths of our demand comes from our insular possessions, and three-sixths is imported from abroad and pays a duty.

I think the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] is correct, that rather than increase the duty on sugar, which is bound to increase under the circumstances the cost to the consumers, it would be better for the country to pay a direct bounty to the sugar-beet and sugar-cane farmers. That is one case in which I think a bounty is applicable.

Mr. ANDRESEN. How about flaxseed?

Mr. RAMSEYER. There is a different situation in connection with flaxseed. We produce about one-half of our flaxseed needs, and we import the other half. We have, however, the area to produce all of our needs, and apparently, from the reports received from the Farm Board, we have the farmers who are willing to raise flaxseed. The wheat raisers of Minnesota and the Dakotas desire to go from wheat to flaxseed. That is a case where I think the protective duty is applicable rather than a bounty.

Mr. CHRISTGAU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHRISTGAU. The gentleman is arguing in favor of a definite provision as to when the bounty shall go into effect?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. CHRISTGAU. Inasmuch as the debenture calls for the establishment of a new public policy, is there not a great deal of merit in the provision which gives the Federal Farm Board the option to invoke the debenture as an experimental policy which might have some beneficial effect later on, especially as long as our agricultural prices are in a fluctuating state?

Mr. RAMSEYER. That would depend altogether on how it would be applied. If the Farm Board would do, and would be supported in doing what the Congress itself ought to do, that is, to specify the commodities, provide for a specific debenture, and provide for a specific time, it might aid. But, to turn this over to a group of men to do whatever they think is advisable under the indefinite and inequitable provisions of the proposal before us, I think would make the situation confronting us a great deal worse than it is.

Now, as to countervailing duties that my colleague [Mr. COLE] asked about a few minutes ago. We have a countervailing duties provision in our tariff law which is carried in the pending tariff bill. Other countries have countervailing duties. There are eight European countries that have such duties, to wit: Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, France, Poland, Portugal, Spain, and Switzerland. The oriental countries having countervailing duties are Japan, Australia, and the Union of South Africa, and in at least one Latin-American country, Argentina. Whether these countries would put into effect their countervailing duties in case we adopt export bounties I do not know. Neither do I know whether other countries that now do not have countervailing duties would enact such duties. The one thing that I am sure of is that if other countries would put into operation countervailing duties against our products benefited by export bounties that would absolutely nullify whatever benefit we might otherwise get from such bounties.

Section 303 is the one on countervailing duties. It is a very strict provision. It is mandatory upon the Secretary of the Treasury whenever he finds that another country pays a bounty on any product sent to this country which is on the dutiable list to increase the duty to the extent of the foreign bounty. The Secretary has no discretion in this matter whatever. In the last eight years the Secretary of the Treasury has invoked the countervailing duty section against foreign products a number of times. I shall place this list in the appendix of my remarks. We also have a strict antidumping provision in the act of 1921, section 201 (a). I shall place a list of the findings of the Secretary of the Treasury under this provision in the appendix also.

There is one thing that I think the advocates of the debenture have overlooked, and that is, if we are to go on an export-bounty basis on a large scale, we should repeal section 303 on countervailing duties of the tariff and thereby give the bounty-fed products of foreign nations the same treatment as we expect foreign nations to give our own bounty-fed products.

There is another suggestion that I wish to make that I think ought to receive some consideration. We all know the President is opposed to this export-debenture plan. A little over a year ago members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture called upon the President for his views on this proposition. In a letter addressed to Senator McNARY, chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, he did express his objections in plain language to this proposition. This letter can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 2, 1929. It has been argued that, even though the President is opposed to this debenture plan, it will do no harm to enact it into law; that

the Farm Board will follow the wishes of the President and not put the debenture into operation. With this proposal applicable to the exports of all farm products everybody should know that if it is enacted into law there will be a great demand and clamor for its use whenever there is the least disturbance in the market of any farm commodity. The board would be swamped with appeals for the debenture. If the board would refuse to act, then the President would be appealed to to compel the board to act or to appoint a new board that would act. For a President to sign such a bill to which he is opposed and which he is determined not to place into operation if enacted into law would be, to say the least, an act of unwisdom.

Mr. Hoover was elected President in 1928. The equalization fee had been a controversial issue for some years. Neither the Republican Party nor the Democratic Party in their national platforms in 1928 would indorse the equalization fee. Mr. Hoover came out unequivocally in opposition to the equalization fee. The platform of neither political party indorsed the debenture plan. Neither Mr. Hoover nor the Republican platform orators during the campaign said anything or advocated anything from which it could be inferred that either Mr. Hoover was or they were for this debenture proposition.

Mr. Hoover made farm relief his major campaign issue. He has a program of his own on farm relief and to place agriculture on an equality with industry. He has a Farm Board, whose members are in sympathy with his program. Up to date, and I say this advisedly, the President has not had a full and fair chance to carry out his program, and I think the American people are willing to give him that full and fair chance. I say he will not have that full and fair chance if the Congress imposes upon him this debenture proposition.

Another thing, this debenture proposition has not been indorsed by the farmers of the country. Before the last campaign the National Farm Bureau Federation, the National Farmers' Union, and other farm organizations indorsed the equalization fee. The National Grange never indorsed the equalization fee. On this debenture proposition the National Grange has indorsed a debenture proposition, but not the Senate debenture amendment. The other great national farm organizations have not indorsed the debenture. This is not the time to enact the Senate proposal into law.

The President has been in office a little over 13 months. He has yet almost three more years to serve. If within the next year or two his program fails to get results, then we will hear a great deal more of the equalization fee and of debentures. In that event we may have to choose one or the other, or both.

The people of the country are looking to the President to lead them out of the present economic difficulties. He was elected for that purpose, and for the present at least the Congress should not impose upon the President a proposition that does not fit into his program of farm relief. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks I submit for printing in the RECORD:

First. Export-debenture tables prepared by the Tariff Commission.

Second. Table prepared by the Department of Agriculture on estimated gross and cash income from farm production.

Third. Letter from Treasury Department, list of Treasury findings and decisions under the antidumping act of 1921, and under the countervailing duty provision of the tariff act of 1922.

## EXPORT DEBENTURES, SECTION 321, H. R. 2667

*I. Proposed export debenture rates applied to exports of agricultural products (except cotton and tobacco) and manufactures thereof, calendar year 1929<sup>1</sup>*

AT DEBENTURE RATES EQUAL TO ONE-HALF THE TARIFF RATES OF H. R. 2667 AS TENTATIVELY AGREED UPON BY THE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE, AS OF APRIL 18, 1930

Commodity	Unit of quantity	Par. No. Senate bill, H. R. 2667	Tariff classification of commodity	Tariff rates in H. R. 2667 as agreed upon by conference committee	Exports, 1929		Debenture cost	Notes
					Quantity	Value		
Hogs.....	No.....	703	Hogs.....	2c per lb.....	27,017	\$164,998	\$37,542	On assumption of average weight of 250 pounds per head.
Sheep.....	No.....	702	Sheep.....	\$3 per head.....	15,431	211,770	23,146	
Poultry, live.....	Lb.....	711	Poultry, live.....	8c per lb.....	448,611	301,301	17,944	
Beef and veal:								
Fresh.....	Lb.....	701	Beef and veal, fresh.....	6c per lb.....	2,917,859	661,669	87,536	
Pickled or cured.....	Lb.....	706	Meats, preserved.....	6c per lb. but not less than 20%.....	10,824,870	1,321,002	324,746	
Pork, fresh.....	Lb.....	703	Pork, fresh.....	2½c per lb.....	13,539,070	2,169,025	169,238	
Wiltshiresides—shoulders, sides, and hams.....	Lb.....	703	Other pork, prepared or preserved.....	3½c per lb.....	5,039,034	717,892	818,843	
Hams and shoulders, cured.....	Lb.....	703	Hams and shoulders.....	3½c per lb.....	125,796,826	26,461,981	2,044,198	
Bacon.....	Lb.....	703	Bacon.....	3½c per lb.....	138,423,370	20,850,928	2,249,380	
Cumberland sides.....	Lb.....	703	Other pork, prepared or preserved.....	3½c per lb.....	5,858,054	1,123,875	95,193	
Pickled.....	Lb.....	703	Other pork, prepared or preserved.....	3½c per lb.....	44,787,116	6,403,050	727,791	
Mutton and lamb.....	Lb.....	702	Mutton, fresh.....	5c per lb.....	835,411	210,807	27,569	On assumption that 80% of exports are lamb, 20% mutton.
			Lamb, fresh.....	7c per lb.....				
Sausage, not canned.....	Lb.....	706	Meats, preserved.....	6c per lb. but not less than 20%.....	3,724,042	1,124,153	112,415	Calculated on the ad valorem rate.
Canned meats:								
Beef.....	Lb.....	706	Meats, preserved.....	6c per lb. but not less than 20%.....	2,606,162	945,462	94,546	Calculated on the ad valorem rate.
Pork.....	Lb.....	703	Pork, prepared or preserved.....	3½c per lb.....	10,239,914	3,694,820	166,399	
Sausage.....	Lb.....	703	Pork, prepared or preserved.....	3½c per lb.....	2,139,100	706,424	34,760	
Other.....	Lb.....	706	Meats preserved.....	6c per lb. but not less than 20%.....	2,265,448	614,887	67,993	Calculated on the specific rate.
Poultry and game, fresh.....	Lb.....	712	Chickens, ducks, geese, guineas, turkeys.....	10c per lb.....	2,472,574	842,303	123,629	
Other meats (including edible offal).....	Lb.....	706	Meats, preserved.....	6c per lb. but not less than 20%.....	41,422,103	4,610,789	1,242,663	Calculated on the specific rate.
Sausage casings:								
Hog casings.....	Lb.....	1758	Sausage casings.....	Free.....	12,905,125	3,490,267	-----	
Beef casings.....	Lb.....	1758	Sausage casings.....	Free.....	16,820,424	2,365,785	-----	
Other casings.....	Lb.....	1758	Sausage casings.....	Free.....	2,911,194	441,335	-----	
Oleo oil.....	Lb.....	701	Oleo oil.....	1c per lb.....	68,208,850	7,501,270	341,044	
Oleo stock.....	Lb.....	701	Tallow.....	½c per lb.....	8,095,202	859,633	20,238	
Tallow.....	Lb.....	701	Tallow.....	½c per lb.....	3,840,020	326,851	9,600	
Lard.....	Lb.....	703	Lard.....	3c per lb.....	847,867,918	107,976,396	12,718,019	
Lard compounds containing animal fats.....	Lb.....	703	Lard compounds and lard substitutes.....	5c per lb.....	3,632,219	457,229	90,805	
Oleo and lard stearin.....	Lb.....	701	Oleo stearin.....	1c per lb.....	3,930,682	440,075	19,653	
Oleomargarine of animal or vegetable fats.....	Lb.....	709	Oleomargarine.....	14c per lb.....	901,625	152,401	63,114	
Milk and cream:								
Fresh or sterilized.....	Gal.....	707	Whole milk.....	6½c per gal.....	180,217	103,571	5,857	
Condensed, sweetened.....	Lb.....	708	Milk, condensed or evaporated, sweetened.....	2½c per lb.....	41,242,812	6,459,419	557,039	
Evaporated.....	Lb.....	708	Milk, condensed or evaporated, unsweetened.....	1.8c per lb.....	68,942,613	5,844,208	620,484	
Dried.....	Lb.....	708	Dried whole milk.....	6½c per lb.....	5,342,301	1,366,794	162,495	
Butter.....	Lb.....	709	Butter.....	14c per lb.....	3,724,245	1,750,278	200,097	

<sup>1</sup> The debenture rates upon manufactured food products have been calculated at one-half the duty on such products in H. R. 2667 as agreed upon by the conference committee instead of on the basis of rates on the basic raw material as proposed in sec. 321, H. R. 2667, as passed by the Senate.



## EXPORT DEBENTURES, SECTION 321, H. R. 2667—Continued

I. Proposed export debenture rates applied to exports of agricultural products (except cotton and tobacco) and manufactures thereof, calendar year 1929—Continued

AT DEBENTURE RATES EQUAL TO ONE-HALF THE TARIFF RATES OF H. R. 2667 AS TENTATIVELY AGREED UPON BY THE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE, AS OF APRIL 18, 1930—contd.

Commodity	Unit of quantity	Par. No. Senate bill H. R. 2667	Tariff classification of commodity	Tariff rates in H. R. 2667 as agreed upon by conference committee	Exports, 1929		Debenture cost	Notes
					Quantity	Value		
Cheese	Lb.	710	Cheese	8c per lb. but not less than 40%.	2,646,009	\$735,333	\$147,067	Calculated on the ad valorem rate.
Infants' foods, malted milk, etc.	Lb.	708	Malted milk and compounds or substitutes for milk or cream.	35% ad valorem	2,126,136	655,844	114,773	
Eggs in the shell	Doz.	713	Eggs of poultry in the shell.	10c per doz.	12,074,830	4,081,363	603,742	
Eggs and yolks, frozen, dried and canned.	Lb.	713	Whole eggs, egg yolk and egg albumen frozen.	8c per lb.	325,706	61,644	13,028	
Meat extracts and bouillon cubes	Lb.	705	Extract of meat, incl. fluid.	15c per lb.	185,116	400,077	13,884	
Gelatin	Lb.	41	Edible gelatin, valued at 40c or more per lb.	20% ad val. and 7c per lb.	269,620	168,696	26,306	
Hides and skins, raw:								
Cattle hides	Lb.	1691	Hides, cattle	10%	22,544,535	3,516,494	175,825	
Calfskins	Lb.	1691	Hides, cattle	10%	6,977,438	1,539,559	76,978	
Sheep and goat skins	Lb.	1769	Skins of all kinds, raw, and hides, n. s. p. f.	Free	1,864,136	577,629		
Other hides and skins	Lb.	1769	Skins of all kinds, raw, and hides, n. s. p. f.	Free	6,358,641	1,161,949		
Horses other than breeding	No.	714	Valued at not more than \$150 per head. Valued at more than \$150 per head.	\$30 per head. 20% ad valorem	7,358	722,202	110,370	Assuming all exports valued at not more than \$150 per head. Statistics do not segregate horses for immediate slaughter.
Mules, asses, and burros	No.	714	Valued at not more than \$150 per head. Valued at more than \$150 per head.	\$30 per head. 20% ad valorem	15,295	1,812,965	229,425	Assuming all exports valued at more than \$150 per head. Statistics do not segregate mules for immediate slaughter.
Barley	Bu.	722	Barley	20c per bu. (48 lbs.)	29,523,077	24,154,866	2,952,308	
Malt	Bu.	722	Barley malt	40c per 100 lbs.	3,380,783	3,334,433	229,893	Exports in bu. converted at 34 lbs. per bu.
Buckwheat	Bu.	723	Buckwheat	25c per 100 lbs.	191,141	212,981	11,468	Exports in bu. converted at 48 lbs. per bu.
Corn	Bu.	724	Corn	25c per bu. (56 lbs.)	33,745,270	34,058,510	4,218,159	
Corn meal	Bbl.	724	Cornmeal	50c per 100 lbs.	267,121	1,330,468	130,889	Exports in bbl. converted at 196 lbs. per bbl.
Hominy and corn grits	Lb.	724	Corn grits	50c per 100 lbs.	14,383,857	304,761	35,960	
Corn breakfast foods ready to eat	Lb.	732	Cereal breakfast foods	20% ad valorem	6,157,114	525,341	52,534	
Oats	Bu.	726	Oats	16c per bu. of 32 lbs.	6,608,727	3,389,111	528,698	
Oatmeal, flaked and rolled oats	Lb.	726	Oatmeal and rolled oats	80c per 100 lbs.	81,245,501	4,220,140	324,982	
Rice	Lb.	727	Rice	14c per lb.	315,441,412	12,129,009	1,971,509	
Rice flour, meal, and broken rice	Lb.	727	Broken rice, rice meal, flour, polish, and bran.	9c per lb.	70,593,596	1,980,679	220,605	
Rye	Bu.	728	Rye	15c per bu. of 56 lbs.	3,433,576	3,612,596	257,518	
Rye flour	Bbl.	728	Rye flour and meal	45c per 100 lbs.	14,764	84,699	6,511	Exports in bbls. converted at 196 lbs. per bbl.
Wheat	Bu.	729	Wheat	42c per bu. of 60 lbs.	90,129,600	111,500,615	18,927,216	Statistics do not segregate wheat unfit for human consumption.
Wheat flour	Bbl.	729	Wheat flour	\$1.04 per 100 lbs.	13,663,457	80,788,765	10,633,038	Exports in bbls. converted at 196 lbs. per bbl. \$3,292,757 debenture on export of wheat flour made from foreign wheat deducted from original total of \$13,925,795.
Biscuits and crackers:								
Plain	Lb.	733	Biscuits, etc.	30% ad valorem	6,743,348	1,114,887	167,233	
Sweetened	Lb.	733	Biscuits, etc.	30% ad valorem	3,874,556	916,221	137,433	
Macaroni	Lb.	725	Macaroni, etc., containing no eggs.	2c per lb.	10,740,479	925,004	107,405	
Wheat breakfast foods:								
Ready to eat	Lb.	732	Cereal breakfast foods	20% ad valorem	1,961,627	181,511	18,151	
To be cooked	Lb.	732	Cereal breakfast foods	20% ad valorem	1,242,040	140,740	14,074	
Cereal foods n. e. s.	Lb.	732	Cereal breakfast foods, etc.	20% ad valorem	4,638,529	496,361	49,636	
Other grains and preparations	Lb.	732	Cereal preparations	20% ad valorem	12,373,749	952,442	95,244	
Hay	Ton.	779	Hay	\$5 per short ton	11,073	267,046	31,004	
Kaffir and milo	Bu.	1558	Raw products, n. s. p. f.	10% ad valorem	2,694,978	2,337,928	116,896	
Beans, dried	Bu.	765	Beans, dried	3c per lb.	291,218	1,162,488	262,060	Exports in bu. converted at 60 lbs. per bu.
Peas, dried	Bu.	769	Peas, dried	1 1/4c per lb.	114,320	483,963	58,017	Exports in bu. converted at 58 lbs. per bu.
Potatoes, white	Bu.	771	Potatoes, white or Irish	75c per 100 lbs.	2,734,530	3,223,436	615,269	Exports in bu. converted at 60 lbs. per bu.
Onions	Bu.	770	Onions	2 1/2c per lb.	580,273	786,507	413,445	Exports in bu. converted at 57 lbs. per bu.
Other fresh vegetables		774	Vegetables, all other	50% ad valorem	199,043,905	6,340,092	1,585,023	Export and tariff classifications not identical but it is believed rates would average at least 50%.
Vegetables, canned:								
Asparagus	Lb.	775	Vegetables, prepared or preserved, n. s. p. f.	35% ad valorem	22,834,475	3,544,726	620,327	
Baked beans and pork and beans	Lb.	765	Beans, prepared or preserved.	3c per lb.	7,664,894	667,013	114,973	
Corn	Lb.	775	Vegetables, prepared or preserved, n. s. p. f.	35% ad valorem	8,366,230	629,133	110,098	
Peas	Lb.	769	Peas, prepared or preserved.	2c per lb.	8,384,573	739,789	83,846	
Soups	Lb.	775	Soups	35% ad valorem	28,751,205	2,722,575	476,451	
Tomatoes	Lb.	772	Tomatoes, prepared or preserved.	50% ad valorem	4,674,113	340,078	85,020	
Other canned vegetables	Lb.	775	Vegetables, prepared or preserved, n. s. p. f.	35% ad valorem	13,126,129	808,444	141,478	

## EXPORT DEBENTURES, SECTION 321, H. R. 2667—Continued

I. Proposed export debenture rates applied to exports of agricultural products (except cotton and tobacco) and manufactures thereof, calendar year 1929—Continued

AT DEBENTURE RATES EQUAL TO ONE-HALF THE TARIFF RATES OF H. R. 2667 AS TENTATIVELY AGREED UPON BY THE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE, AS OF APRIL 18, 1930—contd.

Commodity	Unit of quantity	Par. No. Senate bill, H. R. 2667	Tariff classification of commodity	Tariff rates in H. R. 2667 as agreed upon by conference committee	Exports, 1929		Debenture cost	Notes
					Quantity	Value		
Pickles	Lb.	775	Vegetables, prepared or preserved, n. s. p. f.	35% ad valorem	4,136,192	\$386,367	\$67,614	
Catsup and other tomato sauces	Lb.	775	Vegetables, prepared or preserved, n. s. p. f.	35% ad valorem	11,014,301	1,490,084	260,765	
Other sauces and relishes	Lb.	775	Vegetables, prepared or preserved, n. s. p. f.	35% ad valorem	3,732,241	769,847	134,723	
Vinegar	Gal.	738	Vinegar	8c per proof gal.	318,511	167,680	12,740	
Yeast	Lb.	1558	Unenumerated mfr. article.	20% ad valorem	3,584,074	652,894	65,289	
Other vegetable preparations	Lb.				2,969,034	411,648		No corresponding rate. <sup>1</sup>
Grapefruit	Box.	743	Grapefruit	1½c per lb.	976,264	3,619,743	512,539	70 lbs. per box.
Lemons	Box.	743	Lemons	2½c per lb.	266,358	1,410,485	246,331	74 lbs. per box.
Oranges	Box.	743	Oranges	1c per lb.	5,510,514	18,745,561	1,928,680	70 lbs. per box.
Pineapples	Box.	747	Pineapples	50c per crate	50,791	149,126	12,698	Per crate of 2.45 cu. feet
Apples:								
In boxes	Box.	734	Apples	25c per bu. of 50 lbs.	9,452,588	20,671,242	992,522	Exports in boxes converted at 42 lbs. per box.
In barrels	Bbl.	734	Apples	25c per bu. of 50 lbs.	2,467,948	12,467,077	1,011,859	Exports in bbls. converted at 3.28 bu. per bbl.
Berries	Lb.	736	Berries	1½c per lb.	14,728,517	1,424,832	92,053	
Grapes	Lb.	742	Grapes	25c per cu. ft.	47,306,879	2,463,724	153,747	Exports in lbs. converted at 38.4 lbs. per cu. ft.
Pears	Lb.	749	Pears	1½c per lb.	69,995,885	4,831,872	174,990	
Peaches	Lb.	745	Peaches	1½c per lb.	19,947,316	806,111	49,868	
Other fresh fruit	Lb.	750	Other fresh fruit	35% ad valorem	58,955,119	2,070,470	362,332	
Dried and evaporated fruits:								
Pears	Lb.	749	Pears, dried	2c per lb.	4,576,466	573,302	45,765	
Raisins	Lb.	742	Raisins	2c per lb.	149,686,659	8,390,051	1,496,867	
Apples	Lb.	734	Apples, dried	2c per lb.	37,889,187	4,633,108	378,892	
Apricots	Lb.	735	Apricots, dried	2c per lb.	21,264,616	3,515,207	212,646	
Peaches	Lb.	745	Peaches, dried	2c per lb.	7,785,897	842,091	77,859	
Prunes	Lb.	748	Prunes, dried	2c per lb.	197,227,583	14,837,915	1,972,276	
Other dried and evaporated fruits	Lb.	752	Fruits, dried, n. s. p. f.	35% ad valorem	13,568,690	1,489,398	260,645	
Canned fruits:								
Berries	Lb.	736	Berries, edible, prepared or preserved.	35% ad valorem	12,684,141	1,307,719	228,851	
Apples and apple sauce	Lb.	734	Apples otherwise prepared or preserved.	2½c per lb.	22,963,281	1,185,349	287,041	
Apricots	Lb.	735	Apricots otherwise prepared or preserved.	35% ad valorem	30,246,105	2,947,925	515,887	
Cherries	Lb.	737	Cherries, prepared or preserved in any manner.	9½c per lb. and 40% ad valorem	2,069,091	353,039	168,890	
Prunes	Lb.	748	Prunes, otherwise prepared or preserved.	35% ad valorem	2,616,486	264,293	46,251	
Peaches	Lb.	745	Peaches, otherwise prepared or preserved.	35% ad valorem	90,040,895	8,315,560	1,455,223	
Pears	Lb.	749	Pears, otherwise prepared or preserved.	35% ad valorem	56,075,297	6,241,697	1,092,297	
Pineapples	Lb.	747	Pineapples, otherwise prepared or preserved.	2c per lb.	46,153,359	4,557,493	461,534	
Fruits for salads	Lb.				33,874,645	5,139,561		No corresponding rate. <sup>1</sup>
Other canned fruits	Lb.				10,643,848	1,051,967		No corresponding rate. <sup>1</sup>
Preserved fruits, jellies, and jams	Lb.	751	Jellies, jams, marmalades.	35% ad valorem	2,413,139	455,325	79,682	
Other fruit preparations	Lb.	752	Fruits, otherwise prepared or preserved.	35% ad valorem	23,915,146	1,225,209	214,412	
Peanuts	Lb.	759	Peanuts (shelled)	7c per lb.	4,880,038	408,004	154,026	Assuming an average of 75% shelled, 25% not shelled, the ratio of imports into Canada from the U. S., fiscal year 1929.
			Peanuts (not shelled)	4½c per lb.				
Other nuts	Lb.				6,020,135	1,072,886		No corresponding rate. <sup>1</sup>
Cottonseed oil:								
Crude	Lb.	54	Cottonseed oil	3c per lb.	19,172,131	1,542,241	287,582	
Refined	Lb.	54	Cottonseed oil	3c per lb.	6,902,890	845,415	103,543	
Corn oil	Lb.	53	Oils, n. s. p. f.	20% ad valorem	315,255	42,329	4,233	
Vegetable oil lard compounds	Lb.	703	Lard compounds and lard substitutes.	5c per lb.	6,342,631	866,597	158,566	
Other edible vegetable oils and fats	Lb.				3,893,049	616,804		No corresponding rate. <sup>1</sup>
Molasses	Gal.	502	Testing not above 48% total sugar.	1½c per gal.	8,577,399	768,807	152,249	Assuming an average of 60%.
			Testing above 48% total sugar.	0.275c additional each per cent of total sugar.				
Honey	Lb.	716	Honey	3c per lb.	8,675,707	775,340	130,136	
Glucose (corn sirup)	Lb.	503	Dextrose	2c per lb.	118,523,086	4,412,137	1,185,231	
Grape sugar (corn sugar)	Lb.	503	Dextrose	2c per lb.	7,238,983	268,664	72,390	
Sirup, including maple	Lb.	503	Maple sirup	5½c per lb.	3,175,695	972,814	87,329	
Cornstarch and corn flour	Lb.	83	Starches, n. s. p. f.	1½c per lb.	235,041,590	8,857,751	1,762,812	
Other starch	Lb.	83	Potato starch	2½c per lb.	3,779,129	181,513	47,239	
Broomcorn (long ton)	Ton.	779	Broomcorn	\$20 per short ton.	4,371	597,292	48,955	
Hops	Lb.	780	Hops	24c per lb.	7,677,157	1,383,841	921,259	
Wool and mohair, unmanufactured	Lb.	1,102	Wool in the grease or washed per pound of clean content.	34c per lb.	239,336	87,592	19,123	Assuming exports are of 47% clean content.
Total—Agricultural products (except cotton and tobacco) and manufactures thereof							90,898,922	

<sup>1</sup> "All other" class in export classification does not correspond with "All other" class in tariff classification, so that it is impossible to determine debenture rate which should be used.



II. Proposed export debenture rates applied in accordance with section 331, H. R. 2667 (as passed by the Senate) to exports of leaf tobacco and manufactures thereof, calendar year, 1929.  
[Debiture rates equal one-half the tariff rates of H. R. 2667. (House and Senate bills have identical rates on these paragraphs)]

Commodity	Unit of quantity	Paragraph No. House bill	Tariff classification on commodity	Tariff rate on H. R. 2667	Conversion factor	Exports, 1929		Equivalent exports of raw materials (pounds)	Debiture cost
						Quantity	Value		
Leaf tobacco.....	Lb.....	601	Filler tobacco, if unstemmed.....	35c per lb.....	1.0.....	555,415,451	\$145,810,570	.....	\$97,197,704
Stems, trimming and scrap tobacco.....	Lb.....	601	Filler tobacco, if unstemmed.....	35c per lb.....	1.0.....	10,549,278	318,904	.....	1,846,124
Cigarettes.....	M.....	601	Filler tobacco, if unstemmed.....	35c per lb.....	2.85 lbs. per 1,000.....	8,455,851	16,706,421	24,099,175.35	4,217,356
Chewing tobacco, plug and other.....	Lb.....	601	Filler tobacco, if unstemmed.....	35c per lb.....	.759.....	3,885,754	1,944,027	2,949,287.29	516,125
Smoking tobacco.....	Lb.....	601	Filler tobacco, if unstemmed.....	35c per lb.....	.759.....	1,120,235	733,565	850,258.36	148,795
Other tobacco manufactures.....	Lb.....	601	Filler tobacco, if unstemmed.....	35c per lb.....	.759.....	197,734	111,273	150,080.11	26,264
Tobacco, total.....									103,962,368

<sup>1</sup> Debitures on tobacco products have been calculated on the basis of equivalent exports of the leaf-tobacco debenture rate.

III. Proposed export debenture rates applied in accordance with section 331, H. R. 2667 (as passed by the Senate) to exports of cotton and manufactures thereof, calendar year 1929.

Commodity	Unit of quantity	Debiture rate	Conversion factor	Exports, 1929		Equivalent exports of raw materials	Debiture costs	Notes
				Quantity	Value			
Cotton, unmanufactured.....	Lbs.....	2c per lb.....	1.0	3,981,509,485	\$770,830,254	3,981,509,485.00	\$79,630,190	
Cotton mill waste.....	Lbs.....	2c per lb.....	1.1	59,129,559	6,744,096	65,042,514.90	1,300,850	
Cotton rags, except paper stock.....	Lbs.....	2c per lb.....	1.18	21,095,634	1,541,930	24,892,848.10	497,857	
Cotton batting, carded cotton, and roving.....	Lbs.....	2c per lb.....	1.05	446,301	85,812	468,616.05	9,372	
Cotton yarn:								
Carded yarn, not combed.....	Lbs.....	2c per lb.....	1.18	13,919,250	4,681,954	16,424,715.00	328,494	
Combed yarn.....	Lbs.....	2c per lb.....	1.43	13,571,962	10,843,493	19,407,905.66	388,158	
Cotton thread and cordage:								
Sewing thread.....	Lbs.....	2c per lb.....	1.43	1,053,882	1,149,515	1,507,051.26	30,141	
Crochet, darning, and embroidery cotton.....	Lbs.....	2c per lb.....	1.43	82,825	96,781	118,439.75	2,369	
Twine and cordage.....	Lbs.....	2c per lb.....	1.18	4,588,069	1,811,740	5,413,921.42	108,278	
Cotton cloth, duck, and tire fabric:								
Tire fabric—								
Cord.....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	1.25	4,969,963	2,217,421	6,212,453.75	124,249	
Other.....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	1.25	1,355,239	472,945	1,694,048.75	33,881	
Cotton duck—								
Heavy filter paper dryer, hose and belting duck.....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	2.36	688,618	421,641	1,625,138.48	32,503	
Unbleached—								
Ounce.....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	1.18	6,045,770	1,712,012	7,134,008.60	142,680	
Number.....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	1.18	4,249,118	1,720,523	5,013,959.24	100,279	
Bleached.....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	1.18	2,293,417	743,777	2,706,232.06	54,125	
Colored.....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	1.18	1,842,948	631,575	2,174,678.64	43,494	
Cotton cloth, unbleached (gray):								
Drills and twills.....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	.22	12,469,675	1,580,059	2,743,328.50	54,867	
Sheetings, 40 inches and under.....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	.30	82,174,153	7,166,814	24,652,245.90	493,045	
Sheetings, over 40 inches.....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	.30	1,561,372	170,747	468,411.60	9,368	
Osnaburghs.....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	.60	22,581,106	2,292,148	13,548,663.60	270,973	
All other unbleached.....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	.30	19,050,636	1,235,158	5,715,190.80	114,304	
Cotton cloth, bleached:								
Drills and twills.....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	.22	4,507,030	678,925	991,546.60	19,831	
Pajama checks.....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	.20	10,421,548	1,076,341	2,084,309.60	41,686	
Sheetings, 40 inches wide and under.....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	.30	33,575,043	3,849,494	10,072,512.90	201,450	
Sheetings, over 40 inches.....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	.30	12,960,689	1,712,039	3,888,206.70	77,764	
All other bleached.....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	.20	27,839,039	3,273,673	5,567,807.80	111,356	
Cotton cloth, colored:								
Voiles.....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	.13	56,378,646	8,048,951	7,329,223.98	146,584	
Percalines and prints—								
32 inches and less.....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	.20	29,991,139	3,114,296	5,998,227.80	119,965	
Over 32 inches.....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	.20	11,595,083	1,610,203	2,319,016.60	46,380	
Flannels and flannellettes.....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	.30	4,451,811	684,812	1,335,543.30	26,711	
Khaki and fustians.....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	.22	4,526,474	904,219	995,824.28	19,916	
Denims.....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	.60	17,229,538	3,152,250	10,337,722.50	206,754	
Suitings (drills, etc.).....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	.60	30,343,950	4,927,863	18,206,370.00	364,127	
Gingham.....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	.22	14,001,954	1,466,375	3,080,429.88	61,609	
Chambrays.....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	.22	16,447,828	1,751,199	3,618,522.16	72,370	
All other printed fabrics 7½ yds. per lb. and lighter.....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	.16	27,556,474	4,451,922	4,409,035.84	88,181	
Heavier than 7½ yds. to a lb.....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	.22	20,847,631	3,691,987	4,586,478.82	91,730	
All other piece dyed fabrics:								
5 yds. per lb. and lighter.....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	.18	24,717,873	3,704,941	4,449,163.14	88,983	
Heavier than 5 yds. per lb.....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	.26	19,201,400	2,808,208	4,992,364.00	99,847	
All other yarn-dyed fabrics.....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	.22	19,807,137	2,963,458	4,357,570.14	87,151	
Cotton and rayon mixtures (chief value cotton).....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	.22	18,766,787	5,174,491	4,128,693.14	82,574	
Other cotton fabrics:								
Blankets.....	Lbs.....	2c per lb.....	1.25	1,569,156	885,311	1,961,445.00	39,229	
Damasks.....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	.37	780,072	244,629	288,626.64	5,773	
Pile fabrics, plushes, velveteen, corduroys.....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	.74	494,061	412,193	365,605.14	7,312	
Tapestry and other upholstery goods.....	Sq. yd.....	2c per lb.....	1.00	293,125	305,280	293,125.00	5,862	
Cotton fabrics sold by the pound.....	Lbs.....	2c per lb.....	1.17	10,129,620	3,756,248	11,851,655.40	237,033	
Cotton wearing apparel:								
Knit goods—								
Gloves.....	Doz. prs.....	2c per lb.....	1.20	125,563	\$219,413	\$150,675.60	\$3,014	
Hosiery—								
Women's.....	Doz. prs.....	2c per lb.....	1.80	1,941,831	3,442,369	3,495,295.80	69,906	About 1½ lbs. per doz. finished weight, 20% waste allowed.
Children's.....	Doz. prs.....	2c per lb.....	1.80	751,213	1,143,977	1,352,183.40	27,044	About 1½ lbs. per doz. finished weight, 20% waste allowed.
Men's socks.....	Doz. prs.....	2c per lb.....	1.20	1,084,490	1,855,703	1,301,388.00	26,028	About 1 lb. per doz. finished weight, 20% waste allowed.

<sup>1</sup> Debitures on cotton products have been calculated on the basis of equivalent exports of raw cotton at the raw cotton debenture rate.

III. Proposed export debenture rates applied in accordance with section 321, H. R. 2667 (as passed by the Senate) to exports of cotton and manufactures thereof, calendar year 1929—Continued

Commodity	Unit of quantity	Debenture rate	Conversion factor	Exports, 1929		Equivalent exports of raw materials	Debenture costs	Notes
				Quantity	Value			
Cotton wearing apparel—Continued								
Knit goods—Continued								
Underwear	Doz.	2c per lb.	12.00	610,616	\$2,194,452	7,327,392.00	\$146,548	Only rough estimate possible.
Sweaters, shawls, and other knit outerwear	No.	2c per lb.	1.50	504,912	419,844	757,368.00	15,147	Only rough estimate possible.
Other wearing apparel:								
Collars and cuffs	Doz.	2c per lb.		231,206	311,029			Statistics for estimates not available.
Cotton overalls, breeches, and pants	Doz.	2c per lb.		53,965	662,670			Statistics for estimates not available.
Underwear, not knit	Doz.	2c per lb.		116,511	538,583			Statistics for estimates not available.
Shirts	Doz.	2c per lb.	8.00	236,450	2,072,998	1,891,600.00	37,832	
Dresses, skirts, and waists	No.	2c per lb.	\$1.50	610,126	596,177	397,451.33	7,949	
Other cotton clothing		2c per lb.	\$1.25		1,310,938	1,048,750.40	20,975	
Other cotton manufactures:								
Handkerchiefs	Doz.	2c per lb.	{ 1.40 1.25 }	213,752	145,355	76,423.02	1,528	Assuming 75% of imports to be men's handkerchiefs 3 sq. yds. per doz.; 25% women's, 1.361 sq. yds. per doz.
Laces, embroideries, and lace window curtains	Yd.	2c per lb.	\$3.00	4,264,710	215,750	71,916.67	1,438	
Woven belting for machinery	Lbs.	2c per lb.	1.18	424,119	242,368	500,460.42	10,009	
Cotton bags	Lbs.	2c per lb.	1.17	5,906,326	1,209,801	6,910,401.42	138,208	
Quilts, comforts, counterpanes, and bedspreads	No.	2c per lb.	4.00	184,863	272,529	739,452.00	14,789	
Bed sheets, pillow, bolster, and mattress cases	Doz.	2c per lb.	18.00	36,803	276,563	662,454.00	13,249	
Towels, bathmats, and washcloths	Doz.	2c per lb.	4.00	907,073	1,326,797	3,628,292.00	72,566	
Other cotton manufactures					4,686,196	( <sup>9</sup> )	( <sup>9</sup> )	
Cotton, total							86,725,885	
Grand total, using debenture rates equal to one-half tariff rates of H. R. 2667 as passed by House of Representatives I(A)†II†III							279,741,393	
Grand total, using debenture rates equal to one-half tariff rates of H. R. 2667 as passed by Senate I(B)†II†III							281,336,611	
Grand total, using debenture rates equal to one-half tariff rates of H. R. 2667 as tentatively agreed upon by the Conference Committee as of Apr. 18, 1930—I(C)†II†III							281,577,175	

† Per pound.

† Men's.

† Women's.

† Statistics for estimates not available.

## Estimated gross and cash income from farm production, United States, 1924-1928

(Value in thousands of dollars: i. e., 000 omitted)

Product	Gross value					Gross income					Cash income				
	1924	1925	1926	1927	1928	1924	1925	1926	1927	1928	1924	1925	1926	1927	1928
<b>CROPS</b>															
Corn	2,438,945	2,046,550	2,023,242	2,365,302	2,341,462	429,061	383,482	324,312	408,124	423,417	397,614	362,152	302,692	382,224	396,056
Wheat	1,082,931	972,481	1,014,854	1,047,127	900,754	925,383	804,175	861,799	875,486	764,621	911,316	848,509	848,505	862,173	752,642
Oats	719,653	584,482	506,687	563,119	597,480	217,498	150,428	117,264	116,180	146,696	217,498	150,428	117,264	116,180	146,696
Barley	133,946	131,655	107,602	183,999	204,751	61,842	55,385	36,767	72,920	84,401	61,842	55,385	36,767	72,920	84,401
Rye	62,728	37,585	34,401	49,068	36,002	50,207	27,903	24,119	38,621	26,730	49,886	27,531	23,773	38,248	26,337
Buckwheat	14,341	12,235	11,002	13,318	11,794	10,769	9,480	8,132	10,507	8,851	9,729	8,526	7,296	9,670	7,992
Rice	44,564	49,268	45,621	42,168	37,319	41,698	45,231	42,395	40,558	35,844	41,542	45,179	42,356	40,549	35,836
Grain sorghums	99,766	80,251	74,065	104,712	93,433	16,694	12,135	14,360	28,072	18,749	16,694	12,135	14,360	28,072	18,749
Emmer and spelt	3,191	2,313	1,278	3,213	2,450	276	190	82	269	196	276	190	82	269	196
Popcorn	1,285	3,676	1,651	1,181	1,303	1,285	3,676	1,651	1,181	1,303	1,285	3,676	1,651	1,181	1,303
Cotton lint	1,561,025	1,577,396	1,121,222	1,314,093	1,300,502	1,561,025	1,577,396	1,121,222	1,314,093	1,300,502	1,561,025	1,577,396	1,121,222	1,314,093	1,300,502
Cottonseed	206,190	220,381	172,134	206,971	227,895	148,613	162,543	130,027	156,157	170,974	148,613	162,543	130,027	156,157	170,974
Tobacco	259,139	250,774	236,702	259,875	276,448	259,139	250,774	236,702	259,875	276,448	259,139	250,774	236,702	259,875	276,448
Potatoes, white	315,290	531,689	500,743	456,459	293,679	257,868	430,685	409,185	382,890	234,380	196,284	337,253	324,204	309,554	189,059
Sweetpotatoes	82,098	103,941	98,483	102,588	88,675	79,644	101,212	96,239	100,817	86,730	53,002	72,352	75,054	81,027	66,735
Truck crops	302,671	346,833	287,597	303,231	326,026	302,671	346,833	287,597	303,231	326,026	302,671	346,833	287,597	303,231	326,026
Hay	1,413,193	1,254,585	1,268,419	1,284,620	1,182,969	236,131	204,045	192,622	179,989	178,638	236,131	204,045	192,622	179,989	178,638
Sweet sorghum forage	32,610	28,226	29,073	36,280	28,748	3,053	2,373	2,782	3,534	2,852	3,053	2,373	2,782	3,534	2,852
Flaxseed	68,725	50,746	39,252	49,737	37,316	65,191	47,253	36,163	46,943	34,297	65,191	47,253	36,163	46,943	34,297
Broomcorn	7,454	4,219	4,285	4,212	4,850	7,454	4,219	4,285	4,212	4,850	7,454	4,219	4,285	4,212	4,850
Hemp	11	224	195	112	116	71	224	195	112	116	71	224	195	112	116
Hops	3,415	6,232	7,296	7,024	6,328	3,415	6,232	7,296	7,024	6,328	3,415	6,232	7,296	7,024	6,328
Alfalfa seed	11,231	11,825	9,645	8,315	7,026	10,246	10,822	8,608	5,975	10,246	10,822	8,608	5,975	10,246	10,822
Clover seed, red and alsike	13,311	16,206	13,181	27,527	18,399	10,515	13,346	9,778	24,558	15,277	10,515	13,346	9,778	24,558	15,277
Clover seed, sweet and jap	5,868	5,903	8,817	6,327	4,168	3,941	4,229	6,486	4,094	2,966	3,941	4,229	6,486	4,094	2,966
Timothy seed	8,828	6,561	6,834	5,424	2,977	8,373	6,101	6,460	5,173	2,712	8,373	6,101	6,460	5,173	2,712
Field beans	49,280	52,470	41,383	50,346	68,181	44,484	48,324	38,041	45,964	62,395	44,096	48,030	37,798	45,552	61,865
Soybeans	23,147	23,431	21,808	28,050	29,944	7,034	5,958	5,843	6,510	6,447	7,034	5,958	5,843	6,510	6,447
Cowpeas	31,317	34,552	28,843	36,866	26,768	4,749	4,439	3,773	4,272	3,065	3,239	2,853	2,570	3,276	1,991
Peanuts	44,433	39,480	33,376	47,122	39,213	39,883	35,732	29,304	42,015	34,435	38,807	34,766	28,432	41,009	33,548
Velvet beans	13,545	9,636	11,991	14,520	14,805										
Apples	206,450	215,050	211,896	173,744	200,582	198,644	207,785	199,066	168,929	193,189	160,627	169,233	161,434	131,829	154,452
Peaches	68,084	64,171	68,426	50,494	63,649	65,713	62,504	64,667	49,164	60,253	49,800	48,628	49,838	39,424	44,941
Pears	26,689	29,066	22,899	24,298	24,167	25,888	28,196	21,608	23,599	23,503	21,090	23,257	17,242	19,707	19,624
Grapes	70,251	66,168	64,603	65,332	49,601	69,134	65,299	63,621	64,493	48,160	64,741	61,330	60,208	61,180	45,062
Cranberries	5,485	6,370	5,623	6,089	7,743	5,485	6,370	5,623	6,089	7,743	5,485	6,370	5,623	6,089	7,743
Strawberries	53,859	50,512	58,373	59,179	53,711	53,859	50,512	58,373	59,179	53,711	53,859	49,830	57,759	58,613	53,186
Other berries	28,109	28,311	32,615	36,857	31,881	28,109	28,311	32,615	36,857	31,881	27,687	27,734	32,129	36,385	31,437
Pecans	4,649	7,030	9,772	4,592	4,030	4,649	7,030	9,772	4,592	4,030	3,834	5,962	8,680	3,684	3,602



Estimated gross and cash income from farm production, United States, 1924-1928—Continued  
(Value in thousands of dollars; i. e., 000 omitted)

Product	Gross value					Gross income					Cash income				
	1924	1925	1926	1927	1928	1924	1925	1926	1927	1928	1924	1925	1926	1927	1928
<b>CROPS—CON.</b>															
Oranges	91,338	89,864	104,082	118,313	142,285	91,338	89,864	104,082	118,313	142,285	90,725	89,337	103,587	117,576	141,685
Grapefruit	7,620	16,855	11,146	19,456	18,901	7,620	16,855	11,146	19,456	18,901	7,542	16,739	11,068	19,321	18,791
Other fruits	64,818	63,463	79,285	74,605	81,931	64,510	63,283	78,816	74,468	81,466	60,007	58,903	73,803	70,719	76,966
Other nuts	12,942	19,080	12,450	20,958	15,818	12,942	19,080	12,450	20,958	15,818	12,837	18,526	12,342	20,870	15,714
Maple sirup and sugar	9,285	7,629	9,802	9,166	7,526	9,283	7,629	9,802	9,166	7,526	8,093	6,658	8,508	8,028	6,608
Sugar beets	59,524	47,137	54,904	59,455	50,960	59,524	47,137	54,904	59,455	50,960	59,524	47,137	54,904	59,455	50,960
Sugarcane and sirup	27,344	33,836	24,802	24,219	24,669	24,341	29,525	20,376	19,855	20,786	12,085	16,930	10,171	9,955	12,291
Sorghum sirup	23,579	33,646	29,080	25,716	24,683	17,370	17,399	21,405	18,854	18,138	7,411	7,484	9,219	8,041	7,798
Farm gardens	295,379	301,583	284,349	266,082	303,651	295,379	301,583	284,349	266,082	303,651	295,379	301,583	284,349	266,082	303,651
Nursery products	20,432	20,432	20,432	20,432	20,432	20,432	20,432	20,432	20,432	20,432	20,432	20,432	20,432	20,432	20,432
Forest products	306,427	327,011	317,981	309,852	311,091	306,427	327,011	317,981	309,852	311,091	177,597	189,524	184,291	179,578	180,296
Greenhouse products	76,839	76,839	76,839	76,839	76,839	76,839	76,839	76,839	76,839	76,839	76,839	76,839	76,839	76,839	76,839
Total	10,513,262	9,989,859	9,261,501	10,070,581	9,726,822	6,245,791	6,239,471	5,531,376	5,910,948	5,757,484	5,566,107	5,503,156	4,856,340	5,283,042	5,101,814
<b>ANIMAL PRODUCTS</b>															
Cattle and calves	817,492	878,901	869,504	940,727	1,137,176	921,682	1,002,954	1,010,030	1,005,770	1,124,474	895,397	974,105	982,922	975,233	1,089,124
Hogs	1,186,055	1,598,320	1,753,645	1,570,027	1,387,122	1,323,975	1,666,402	1,757,626	1,506,949	1,477,721	1,088,016	1,340,698	1,413,332	1,208,929	1,208,866
Sheep and lambs	148,803	173,568	174,872	177,508	197,406	133,966	152,612	155,876	150,962	171,463	131,145	149,487	152,848	147,628	168,091
Poultry (chickens)	371,333	410,827	462,333	457,823	444,208	390,991	408,088	445,631	449,314	457,464	229,574	233,710	274,729	261,350	279,854
Eggs	609,638	722,925	735,323	668,218	746,285	583,562	691,897	704,037	639,868	717,103	430,312	519,929	545,934	490,318	560,288
Milk	1,767,366	1,852,191	1,896,855	2,005,097	2,061,464	1,677,561	1,758,841	1,804,605	1,910,545	1,965,358	1,231,776	1,302,654	1,359,099	1,469,154	1,509,962
Wool	87,401	97,245	88,485	86,240	109,299	87,401	97,245	88,485	86,240	109,299	87,401	97,245	88,485	86,240	109,299
Mohair	6,509	5,790	7,219	7,537	10,228	6,509	5,790	7,219	7,537	10,228	6,509	5,790	7,219	7,537	10,228
Bees products	11,597	11,934	11,129	12,490	9,493	11,597	11,934	11,129	12,490	9,493	8,088	8,355	7,078	9,376	6,127
Horses	50,921	44,736	38,056	38,028	36,998	16,163	14,749	16,227	14,973	15,406	16,163	14,749	16,227	14,973	15,406
Mules	26,467	22,787	17,211	16,086	15,205	12,533	10,537	10,194	12,701	12,216	12,533	10,537	10,194	12,701	12,216
Total	5,083,582	5,819,224	6,054,632	5,979,781	6,154,884	5,165,940	5,821,049	6,011,059	5,797,349	6,070,225	4,136,914	4,657,259	4,858,667	4,683,439	4,969,741
Grand total	15,596,844	15,809,083	15,316,133	16,050,362	15,881,706	11,411,731	12,060,520	11,542,435	11,710,297	11,827,709	9,703,021	10,160,415	9,715,007	9,966,481	10,071,555

NOTE.—The values shown above for feed and seed crops, horses, and mules, include sales by farmers in some States eventually bought by farmers in other States. These interfarm sales tend to overstate the total income from farm production for the country as a whole.

THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
BUREAU OF CUSTOMS,  
Washington, December 4, 1929.

HON. C. W. RAMSEYER,  
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. RAMSEYER: Referring to your letter of November 30, 1929, I inclose a list of decisions issued under the countervailing duty (bounty) provisions of section 303 of the tariff act of 1922, and a list of the findings of dumping issued under the antidumping act of 1921. You will find a file of these decisions (except the first three, which are in manuscript), in the office of the legislative counsel of the House, room 197, House Office Building. If you are interested in the first three, which were not published, copies of them will also be furnished upon your request.

The term "countervailing" is sometimes also applied to the class of contingent duties found in paragraphs 369, 371, and certain other paragraphs of the tariff act of 1922, whereby under certain conditions duty is assessed at the same rate that the country of exportation imposes on similar articles from the United States. If you are interested in this class of decisions, I shall be glad to furnish a list thereof, but almost, if not all of them, merely give, for the information of customs officers, the rates of duty imposed by the foreign country which are to be applied here.

Very truly yours,

F. X. A. EBLE,  
Commissioner of Customs.

List of findings by the Secretary of the Treasury under the antidumping act of 1921, section 201 (a)

Article	Date of finding	Treasury decision
Goatskin parchment paper	Oct. 11, 1921	(9)
Cotton embroideries	Nov. 1, 1921	(9)
Hamburgs from Austria	Jan. 13, 1922	(9)
Hamburgs from Switzerland	Feb. 25, 1922	39025
Veneer chair seats from Canada	Mar. 3, 1922	39027
Peeled tomatoes in tins from Italy	Mar. 4, 1922	39028
Rugs from Canada	Mar. 6, 1922	39032
Tissue paper from England	Mar. 13, 1922	39036
Revoked	Apr. 27, 1922	39089
Cut-glass ware from England	Mar. 28, 1922	39052
Photo dry plates from England	Mar. 31, 1922	39053
Sheathing paper from British Columbia	Apr. 18, 1922	39067
Hamburgs from Switzerland	Feb. 25, 1922	39025
Revoked	Apr. 22, 1922	39086
Flour, wheat, from Canada	Apr. 23, 1922	39071
High-pressure tube gauge glasses from England	May 19, 1922	39119
Revoked	Sept. 5, 1925	41084
Fountain syringes from Canada	May 26, 1922	39139
Raspberries, canned, red, from Ontario, Canada	June 19, 1922	39177
Oxide of iron from Quebec	July 26, 1922	39210
Sole leather from Ontario	Aug. 3, 1922	39220

1 Circular letter.

List of findings by the Secretary of the Treasury under the antidumping act of 1921, section 201 (a)—Continued

Article	Date of finding	Treasury decision
Brick, plastic, from Quebec	Oct. 13, 1922	39272
Earthenware cereal sets from Czechoslovakia	Oct. 16, 1922	39277
Revoked	Sept. 22, 1923	39793
Decorated chinaware jugs from Czechoslovakia	Oct. 28, 1922	39293
Revoked	Sept. 22, 1923	39793
Canvas from England	Oct. 30, 1922	39294
Roofing, or deadening felt, from British Columbia	Nov. 4, 1922	39303
China cereal sets from Czechoslovakia	Dec. 14, 1922	39360
Revoked	Sept. 22, 1923	39793
Rubber balls from Germany	Jan. 20, 1923	39422
Castings, No. 1 spuds, malleable, from Ontario	Feb. 26, 1923	39481
Ferrosilicon, from Ontario, Canada	Mar. 23, 1923	39542
Revoked	Jan. 10, 1925	40603
Veneers, or thin lumber from Quebec	Apr. 16, 1923	39583
Calcium carbide from Quebec	May 16, 1923	39635
Revoked	June 12, 1923	39686
Pig iron from Ontario	Mar. 25, 1925	40762
Paper-white sulphite wrapping or bag from Germany	July 1, 1925	41005
Strychnine from Switzerland	July 28, 1925	41045
Magnesium chloride fused from Germany	Aug. 27, 1925	41079
Pins, common and safety, from Germany	July 19, 1926	41713
Colored antique window glass from England	Sept. 9, 1926	41781
Revoked	Apr. 14, 1927	42103
Pig iron from Germany	Jan. 29, 1927	41965
Suspended	Nov. 22, 1928	43047
Phosphate rock, Morocco	Feb. 9, 1928	42577
Lighting carbons from Germany	Sept. 18, 1928	42965

2 Reversed by Court of Customs Appeals—43475.

List of decisions under section 303, tariff act 1922 (bounties)

Country	Article	Treasury Decision	Date
Australia	Sugar in certain articles	39310	Nov. 16, 1922
Do.	do.	39541	Mar. 24, 1923
Do.	do.	39789	Sept. 17, 1923
Do.	Fencing wire (galvanized sheets), traction engines.	39722	July 2, 1923
Do.	do.	40001	Feb. 6, 1924
Do.	Butter	42537	Sept. 5, 1928
Do.	do.	43067	Dec. 5, 1928
South Africa	Cattle and beef	39746	July 20, 1923
Spain	Coal	39830	Oct. 19, 1923
Netherlands	Yellow prussiate of soda	40885	May 25, 1925
India	Pig iron	41500	Apr. 16, 1923
Do.	do.	41730	Aug. 6, 1926
Do.	do.	42161	Apr. 30, 1927
Germany	Rolling mill products	41561	May 13, 1926
Do.	do.	41628	June 18, 1926
Do.	do.	41964	Jan. 31, 1927
Great Britain	Spun silk yarn	42865	July 24, 1928
Do.	Silk or artificial silk, manufactures of.	43634	Oct. 30, 1929

# 

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, after conference with the minority members of the Ways and Means Committee and the majority members, I wish to ask unanimous consent that during the remainder of the week the House meet at 11 o'clock instead of 12 o'clock.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] asks unanimous consent that during the remainder of the week the House meet at 11 o'clock instead of 12 o'clock. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] is ill in bed.

Mr. TILSON. We have communicated with him by telephone, and also with Mr. CRISP, and it is agreeable to all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] if it is the purpose of the House to sit on Saturday of this week?

Mr. TILSON. Yes. It is the purpose to continue until the tariff bill is finished, as far as this House is concerned.

## 

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on April 26, 1930, at La Grange, Ga., in my district, a most comprehensive, illuminating, and historical address was delivered on the occasion of Confederate Memorial Day by Mr. A. W. Cozart, an eminent scholar and jurist. This address shows great research and contains historical data which is not generally known. I ask permission to extend my remarks by having it printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing a historical address delivered in the State of Georgia a short time ago by a distinguished gentleman. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the memorial address by Mr. A. W. Cozart on the occasion of Confederate Memorial Day.

The address is as follows:

### 

By A. W. Cozart, of the Columbus, Ga., bar, delivered at Lagrange, Ga., April 26, 1930

Confederate veterans, ladies of the memorial association, ladies and gentlemen, one of the clamant needs of our southern people is a better knowledge of the history of the Southland. Such a knowledge would make our people as patriotic as they are proud.

The Southland is the land of arborescent vistas, the land of perpetually efflorescent gardens, the land of cerulean heavens, the land with rubescent mornings and evenings, the land of vallant and gallant men and women who are winsome but wise.

### 

(a) Slavery was the exciting and proximate cause of the War between the States. Had there been no slavery, there would have been no war, and had the South not made a financial success under and on account of slavery, there would have been no war.

(b) Georgia prohibited slavery from 1735 until 1749.

(c) "In 1760 South Carolina passed an act prohibiting the further importation of negro slaves, but it was rejected by the British Crown, the governor of the colony was reprimanded, and the governors of all the Colonies were warned not to countenance such legislation."

(d) In 1827 there were 126 antislavery societies in Southern States and only 24 in Northern States.

(e) In 1770 Rhode Island had 150 vessels in the slave trade.

(f) "Capt. Nathaniel Gordon, master of the ship *Erie*, was hanged in New York Tombs for violating the law making slave transportation a capital offense, passed by Congress in 1820. He was the only man ever so punished—and both he and his ship hailed from Portland, Me." (They Also Rans, p. 107, by Don. C. Seitz.)

(g) There were less than 400,000 persons in the South who owned slaves when the War between the States began. They owned about 4,000,000 slaves, and had several billion dollars invested in them. As there were so few persons who owned slaves, comparatively speaking, the war was called by many "a rich man's war and a poor man's fight." In the mountain sections of north Alabama, north Georgia, east Tennessee, and in the Carolinas there were vast numbers who owned not a slave. East Tennessee furnished more volunteers to the Union Army than New Hampshire, Maine, and Massachusetts all put together.

(h) The South could not well liberate her slaves on account of the vast sum invested in them. She was in the position of the man who swallowed the egg. He said if he moved it would break, and if he didn't the darned thing would hatch.

(i) The United States Constitution provided that fugitive slaves should be returned by the States. Between 12 and 15 Northern States

passed laws to nullify this provision of the Constitution and the acts of Congress passed in pursuance of the Constitution requiring the return of fugitive slaves. The North disregarded the United States Constitution. The North disregarded the acts of Congress. The North disregarded the mandates of the Supreme Court of the United States; and touching the question of fugitive slaves the North disregarded every obligation imposed by law upon her toward the South. Great constitutional lawyers from Massachusetts, including Daniel Webster, Rufus Choate, and Caleb Cushing, and great patriots like Edward Everett, repeatedly said and proclaimed boldly to the world that the South was right in her position on the fugitive slave question. Fanatics, poets, and low politicians took the opposite view and fanned the flame until it was a mighty conflagration. They were responsible for the greatest tragedy which has occurred on this continent.

(j) Rawle was a great constitutional lawyer and legal author of Philadelphia. He wrote a textbook, *View of the Constitution*, which was a textbook at West Point and studied by Robert E. Lee, Albert Sidney Johnston, Joseph E. Johnston, Jefferson Davis, and others. He taught in this book and demonstrated it beyond any doubt that the States had a right to secede. (See *Life of Alexander H. Stephens*, by Pendleton, pp. 218, 219.)

(k) Daniel Webster opposed the War of 1812, and in the House of Representatives he opposed the conscription bill, and in 1814 he intimated that Massachusetts would secede if driven to it. Massachusetts and other New England States threatened to secede on or about the same date. As late as 1843 and 1845 Massachusetts threatened to secede in the event or on account of the annexation of Texas. In the Hayne-Webster debate it might have been appropriate for some northern man to speak against nullification by South Carolina of the laws of Congress, but Webster was hardly the man to do so. He said Massachusetts needed no encomium. I think myself that Massachusetts deserved no eulogy. Boston did more to bring on the Revolutionary War and the War Between the States, with less cause, than any other city or any other community.

(l) For the reasons which I have stated, the South had a legal right and a moral right to secede. In her situation, the right of revolution would have been justified had she had no technical right to secede.

### 

(a) Lyman Beecher was bitterly opposed to the abolition of negro slavery. He had seven sons who were ministers and he was the father of Harriet Beecher Stowe.

His most distinguished son, Henry Ward Beecher, and his daughter, Harriet Beecher Stowe, were among the bitterest abolitionists.

(b) Robert E. Lee liberated his negro slaves before Lincoln signed his Emancipation Proclamation but Grant's slaves were emancipated by the proclamation.

(c) Harriet Beecher Stowe and Gen. William T. Sherman were among the mightiest forces for the abolition of slavery, but both of them, after the War Between the States, opposed the enfranchisement of the negroes.

(d) Robert G. Ingersoll and Henry Ward Beecher supported Grant for President, but later they favored Grover Cleveland.

### 

(a) Dr. U. B. Phillips, one of your own distinguished citizens, in his new book, *Life and Labor in the Old South* (p. 184), says:

"A British voyager on an Alabama steamboat just after the war told: 'A gentleman of color, working on one of the boats, was asked the other day whether he was best off now or before he was free. He scratched his wool and said, "Wall, when I tumbled overboard before the captain he stopped the ship and put back and picked me up; and they gave me a glass of hot whisky and water; and then they gave me 20 lashes for falling overboard. But now if I tumble overboard the captain he'd say, "What's dat? Oh! only dat dam nigger—go ahead!"' The slaves might be chastened but they were sure to be cherished."

(b) Dr. W. H. Wilcox, of Cornell University, a Government statistician, in an address before the American Sociological Science Association, at Saratoga, September 6, 1899, showed that negroes were nearly three times as criminal in the Northeast and more than three times as criminal in the Northwest, in proportion to numbers, as they were in the South at the time of the estimate.

(c) Many negroes desire to obtain an education so that they can get a living without manual labor. This is illustrated by one of Booker Washington's stories about the negro who was working in a cotton field. He suddenly stopped, and, looking toward the skies, said: "O Lawd, de cotton am so grassy, de work am so hard, and de sun am so hot dat I b'lieve dis darky am called to preach!"

Booker Washington also tells this good story: He asked an old negro about 60 years old to tell him something of his history. The old man said he had been born in Virginia and sold into Alabama in 1845. Washington asked him how many were sold at the same time. He said, in reply, "There were five of us; myself and brother and three mules."



*Confederate generals who were northern born, birthplace, and rank in United States Army at beginning of or before war*

Gen. Samuel Cooper, New Jersey, colonel, adjutant general.  
 Maj. Gen. Samuel Gibbs French, New Jersey.  
 Brig. Gen. Julius Adolphus deLagnel, New Jersey, second lieutenant, Artillery.  
 Lieut. Gen. John C. Pemberton, Pennsylvania, captain, Fourth Artillery.  
 Brig. Gen. John Kelly Duncan, Pennsylvania, second lieutenant, Artillery Reserves in 1855.  
 Brig. Gen. Josiah Gorgas, Pennsylvania, captain, Ordnance.  
 Maj. Gen. Luther Martin Smith, New York, captain, Top'l Engineers.  
 Brig. Gen. Archibald Gracie, New York, captain, dropped in 1861.  
 Brig. Gen. Franklin Gardner, New York.  
 Brig. Gen. Walter H. Stevens, New York, lieutenant, Engineers.  
 Brig. Gen. Daniel Marsh Frost, New York, second lieutenant, Artillery Reserves in 1853.  
 Brig. Gen. Albert Pike, Massachusetts.  
 Brig. Gen. Edward A. Perry, Massachusetts.  
 Brig. Gen. Albert Gallatin Blanchard, Massachusetts.  
 Maj. Gen. Daniel Ruggles, Massachusetts, captain.  
 Maj. Gen. Bushrod R. Johnson, Ohio.  
 Brig. Gen. Otto French Strahl, Ohio.  
 Brig. Gen. Daniel H. Reynolds, Ohio, lieutenant.  
 Brig. Gen. Danville Leadbetter, Maine, captain, reserves in 1857.  
 Maj. Gen. Lunsford L. Lomax, Rhode Island, lieutenant, Cavalry.  
 Maj. Gen. Mansfield Lovell (born of New York parents), Washington, D. C., captain, reserves in 1854.  
 Brig. Gen. Clement Hoffman Stevens, Connecticut.  
 Brig. Gen. Francis Asbury Shoup, Indiana. Light Artillery Reserves in 1860.  
 Brig. Gen. Lawrence Sullivan Ross, Iowa. (Came to Alabama when small boy.)

Brig. Gen. James L. Alcorn, Illinois. (Born in Illinois of southern parents. He was elected a brigadier general by the Mississippi State convention, but Jefferson Davis refused to grant him a commission.)

Thus it appears that the North furnished to the Confederacy 25 generals: One full general, 1 lieutenant general, 6 major generals, and 17 brigadier generals. New Jersey, Ohio, and Pennsylvania each furnished 3; Massachusetts, 4; and New York, 5. Nine were officers in the United States Army at the beginning of the war, and resigned to become members of the Confederate Army, and 6 had previous to the war been officers in the United States Army.

Albert Sidney Johnston was born in Kentucky of parents who just a few months prior to his birth had moved there from Connecticut. He had not a drop of cavalier blood in his veins.

FEDERAL GENERALS WHO WERE SOUTHERN BORN

Fifty-two generals in the Federal Army, during the war between the States, were born in the South, of whom 19 were major generals and 33 brigadier generals.

Twenty-five were born in Kentucky, 14 in Virginia, 3 in Tennessee, 3 in Alabama, 2 in Florida, 2 in South Carolina, and 1 in each of the following States: Georgia, Louisiana, and North Carolina.

CONFEDERATE GENERALS WHO LOST THEIR LIVES IN THE SERVICE OF THE CONFEDERACY DURING THE WAR

One full general, 3 lieutenant generals, 13 major generals, 76 brigadier generals, and 4 acting brigadier generals, making a total of 97 generals, lost their lives in the service.

Three lost their lives at the Battle of Petersburg, 4 at the Battle of Atlanta, 5 at the Battle of Chickamauga, 5 at the Battle of Sharpsburg, 6 at the Battle of Gettysburg, and 7 at the Battle of Franklin.

Brig. Gen. Robert S. Garnett, the first killed, was killed July 13, 1861; Brig. Gen. Robert C. Tyler, the last one killed, was killed April 16, 1865, at West Point, Ga., just across the Alabama line.

FEDERAL GENERALS WHO LOST THEIR LIVES DURING THE WAR BETWEEN THE STATES

Forty-seven Federal generals, of whom 12 were major generals and 35 were brigadier generals, lost their lives during the War between the States.

Five were killed at Gettysburg, 3 at Antietam (Sharpsburg), 3 at Chancellorsville, 3 at Spottsylvania, and 2 at each of the following places: Stones River, Kenesaw Mountain, Perryville, Fredericksburg, the Wilderness, and Chantilly.

Brig. Gen. Nathaniel Lyon was the first one killed. He was killed at Wilsons Creek, Mo., August 10, 1861. Brig. Gen. Thomas A. Smyth was the last one killed. He was killed at Farmville, Va., April 9, 1865.

It is interesting to note that 6 Confederate generals and 5 Federal generals were killed at Gettysburg and 7 Confederate generals were killed at Franklin but no Federal general lost his life at Franklin.

ROBERT E. LEE

(a) "It is not generally known, I believe, that Robert E. Lee was a blood relative of John Marshall, the great Chief Justice, and Thomas

Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence, and twice President of the United States. Marshall's mother, Mary Keith; Jefferson's mother, Jane Randolph; and Lee's grandmother, Mary Bland; were all three granddaughters of Col. William Randolph." The home of Randolph was on an island in the James River. (Lincoln, Lee, Grant, and other Biographical Addresses, by Emory Speer, p. 47.)

(b) It is not generally known, I believe, that Robert E. Lee had three sons, all of whom were officers in the Confederate Army. George Washington Custis Lee, his eldest son, was graduated from West Point at the head of his class, was a major general in the Confederate Army, was made president of Washington College to succeed his father; William Henry Fitzhugh Lee, his second son, was a graduate from Harvard, was a major general of cavalry, and was a Member of Congress from Virginia; and Robert E. Lee, jr., his third son, one of his biographers, was a captain.

(c) "Is it not indeed an immortal glory for Virginia to have produced the noblest soldier (George Washington) of the Revolution, and the noblest (George Henry Thomas) that fought for the North in the Civil War, as well as the noblest (Robert E. Lee) that fought for the South." (Union Patriots, by Gamaliel Bradford, p. 129.)

(d) I have said on many occasions that Robert E. Lee had the training and culture of a West Point honor graduate, but he was more than a scholar; the chains of habit and passion did not fetter him, but he was more than a moral man—he possessed and practiced the virtues of a Christian exemplar; in his veins flowed the best blood of Virginia, but his virtues were not due to the fact that he was the cavalier of cavaliers; in person, he was one of God's handsomest creations, but his nobility did not reside in his physique; he was a great commander, but military achievements were not his sole praise. His preeminent glory was his fidelity to duty. He was the model for and the type of our best Confederate soldier.

CHARMED LIVES

We read with amazement that Marshal Ney had five horses shot from under him at the Battle of Waterloo, but hear these remarkable facts:

Gen. William T. Sherman had 3 horses shot from under him at the Battle of Shiloh; Maj. Gen. Benjamin Franklin Cheatham had 3 horses shot from under him at the Battle of Stone River; Lieut. Gen. Daniel Harvey Hill had 3 horses shot from under him at the Battle of Sharpsburg; Lieut. Gen. A. P. Stewart had 3 horses shot from under him at the Battle of Resaca; Acting Brig. Gen. Claudius C. Wilson had 3 horses shot from under him at the Battle of Chickamauga; Lieut. Gen. Joseph Wheeler had 16 horses shot from under him while in the Confederate service; and Lieut. Gen. Nathan Bedford Forrest had 29 horses shot from under him while in the Confederate service.

ANDERSONVILLE

It has been thought and believed in the North that Jefferson Davis was responsible for the suffering of Northern prisoners in Southern prisons. For his alleged cruelties, the North considered no epithets too vile and no insults too great to be heaped upon him. The late United States Senator John Warwick Daniel, of Virginia, said:

"It is clearly demonstrated now that far from sharing any responsibility for the suffering of prisoners, Jefferson Davis did his best to alleviate them. He tried to get exchanges; he sent a delegation of prisoners to Washington to represent their own situation; he sent Alexander H. Stephens on a mission for the same purpose; he proposed that each side send surgeons, money, and medicines to their men in captivity; he established prisons in the most fertile parts of the Southland; and finally he gave up Federal prisoners, both sick and well, without exchange, rather than have them suffer in Confederate hands. There were 60,000 more Federal prisoners in southern prisons than Confederate prisoners in northern prisons, and yet 4,000 more Confederates died in prison. It is easier to protect from cold than from heat, and the North was tenfold more able to provide for captives than the South. There is no argument possible that would convict Jefferson Davis of cruelty to prisoners that would not more deeply convict Abraham Lincoln of the same charge."

CONCLUSION

The Federal Government maintains more than 84 national cemeteries, in which are buried most of the soldiers who lost their lives in the Union Army. A few of the Confederate dead, very few, are buried in these cemeteries. "Little Joe" Wheeler is buried in Arlington National Cemetery. Thousands of the Confederate dead lie in unknown graves.

I hope that each of our Confederates may have a mansion in the skies with foundations of malachite and azurite, with walls of chalcedony, with doors of ruby, with windows of diamonds, with floors of amethyst, with ceilings of sapphire, and with roof of amazonite and emerald, lighted up by the radiance and effulgence and glory which emanate from the throne of the everliving and triune God!

LUMBER, SHINGLES, AND THE TARIFF BILL

Mr. KORELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks upon the subject of lumber, shingles, and the

tariff bill, and to incorporate therein a letter I have received from one of the friends of these industries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD upon the subject of lumber, shingles, and the tariff bill, and to include therein a letter received upon those subjects. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORELL. Mr. Speaker, on April 14 the House granted me the courtesy of incorporating with my remarks upon the subject "Lumber, Shingles, and the Tariff Bill," a brief statement prepared by friends of the lumber and shingle industries, stressing the necessity of retaining the duties already voted on lumber and shingles in the pending tariff bill.

In an effort to combat the force of the arguments, which appeared in this brief statement, Mr. C. D. Root, secretary of the Retail Lumber Dealers' Association of Indiana, has written a letter to Hon. FRED S. PURNELL, which was incorporated with Mr. PURNELL's remarks appearing in the RECORD last Monday, challenging the accuracy of the assertion that the information contained in the statement that I had incorporated and particularly that the statement was based upon Government records. This letter has been read by the friends of the lumber and shingle industries, and one of their number, Mr. A. C. Edwards, of Everett, Wash., has undertaken to answer it in a communication that he has addressed to me.

I venture to suggest to the Members of the House that if the statement that I inserted on April 15, Mr. Root's letter to Representative PURNELL, and Mr. Edwards's letter to me are carefully read that the issue between the proponents and the opponents of tariff protection for lumber and shingles will clearly appear and that every believer in the soundness of the principle of a protective policy will be fully convinced that the duties already voted on lumber and shingles in the pending tariff bill should be retained.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 30, 1930.

HON. FRANKLIN F. KORELL,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. KORELL: My attention has been called to a letter printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 7899-7901, April 28, 1930, written by Mr. C. D. Root, who signs himself as secretary of the Retail Lumber Dealers' Association of Indiana.

He asserts that the statements contained in The Plain Facts About the Lumber and Shingle Tariffs are false. Answering what may be fairly termed "mere misrepresentations," may I suggest let the Government records and cold facts speak for themselves. They answer every charge Mr. Root has made.

It is asserted that Plain Facts contained no citations sustaining its statements. Reference to the statement will show quotations from the President's messages, from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, from Labor, Census, and Commerce Department records, and from reports of the United States Tariff Commission. Plain Facts relied solely on Government statistics and Government records. If they are wrong, then Plain Facts are incorrect.

1. The unemployment problem: Claim is made that unemployment totaling 160,000 is false. In figuring this item care was taken to be conservative. Total lumber-industry workmen was figured in round numbers at 800,000 and a 20 per cent idleness, producing a figure of 160,000. However, it is nearer correct to accept the statement of Senator STEIWER, as follows: "The Department of Commerce furnished me one estimate of the average number of employees as 886,889." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 27, 1930, p. 4392.) Trend of Employment and Labor Turnover, March, 1930, a Labor Department bulletin, says mill employment totals 73.7 per cent, so there is idleness of 26.3 per cent, or total lumbering idleness of 233,251 (26.3 per cent of 886,889). Current reports, not completely verified, now place total idleness considerably in excess of even those figures, but it will have to be admitted the original figures were entirely too conservative.

It shall not be my aim to answer argument. That's largely opinion, and the argument advanced by Mr. Root is so clearly unsound it needs no answer, but is, for the major part, answered by quotations from reports of the United States Tariff Commission, contained herein.

2. Opposition to a lumber and shingle tariff: Plain Facts emphatically states:

"Every witness that appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of the House or Finance Committee of the Senate, opposing lumber and shingle tariffs, was an owner of foreign mill and timber or importing interests, an importer, or the agent or employee of a foreign mill and timber or importing interests."

That assertion remains unchallenged. It is proven by the records of the committees named and stands as an undisputed and admitted fact.

A list of names, presumably opponents of lumber and shingle tariffs, is submitted by Mr. Root. It is presumed they are retailers. Retailers are what is known as "middlemen" and middlemen from time immemorial have been against tariffs of nearly all kinds. They are in the

main, and probably totally, importers of lumber and shingle products. They desire to play foreign prices against American prices to drive down the price they pay for lumber and shingle products, solely for their individual gain and profit, and not in the interest of the consumer, the American workmen, or American commercial activities. Their motive is purely selfish.

3. Who wants the lumber and shingle tariff: It is claimed the lumber industry tariff committee has not submitted a list of its membership. That is true. The lumber industry tariff committee does not profess an organization except to work for a tariff in behalf of American labor, American business, and American commercial activities. By reference to the large number of labor petitions on file in the United States Senate, it will be seen that thousands of American workmen are asking for lumber and shingle tariffs. Investigation will disclose that there are no American mills, free from foreign or importing entanglements but what want, and for the greater part, are asking for lumber and shingle tariffs and further investigation will disclose that American commercial activities are also asking for such tariffs. Those are the several interests represented by the lumber industry tariff committee. The only ones who question the representation of the lumber industry tariff committee are foreign and importing interests. There is no doubt as to the authenticity of the representation of the lumber industry tariff committee. They represent American interests and American interests only.

Mr. Root says the number of mills in the United States total 8,723. According to Senator STEIWER, quoting from the Census Bureau, the number operating in 1925 was 15,621, and in 1928, the number was 13,266. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 27, 1930, p. 4399.) The Census Bureau is no doubt the best authority, but it admits the non-inclusion of a very large number of small mills.

4. Importance of American lumbering operations: Apparently an effort is made to decry the fact that 946,871 farmers own 35,270,527 acres of timberlands. The slur does not need nor is it entitled to a reply.

Mention is made that Indiana has only 39,909 farmers, who own 809,824 acres of wooded lands. No doubt these Indiana farmers value these lands highly, and will resent belittling their holdings.

Further Indiana statistics should have been quoted, which are that in 1927 Indiana lumbering operations gave employment to 5,252 workmen, and paid them a wage of \$14,665,802. (Census of Manufacturers, 1927, p. 45.)

Chances are that Indiana workmen prefer to have American labor, the purchasers of their products, who draw pay checks, employed, instead of driving them to idleness, so that they can purchase the products of farm and factory. American farmers and manufacturers generally know that idle labor means decreased purchases and business stagnation, and they are unwilling to take the chance of selling their products to the orientals of Canada or peasants of Europe.

5. Lumber-industry distress: Attention is called to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 8, 1930 (pp. 3296-3300), and February 27, 1930 (pp. 4378-4383), pretending to show lumber industry prosperity. In this connection, one should read page 5469 of same RECORD, November 12, 1929, and 4402 of February 27, 1930; the first presenting a report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, clearly showing losses and distress, and the latter submitting indisputable evidence of the falsity of the assertions on pages 3296-3300, 4378-4383, above referred to. Clearly, the criticism of Plain Facts is a one-sided consideration, with utter disregard for truth or facts.

I must decline to comment on the asserted statistics offered by Mr. Root, most of which are argumentative, because I can neither verify nor disprove them from a careful search of Census, Labor, and Commerce reports. They do not correspond with Government reports.

Canadian lumber production has increased 160 per cent in the past 10 years. Facts about Canada, page 58, British Columbia shingle production has gained 399 per cent since the tariff was removed from shingles in 1913. Page 51, Tariff Commission's report on shingles, United States production of shingles and lumber has greatly decreased. That can be seen from any of the Government records. Canadian lumber exports to the United States average about 1,500,000,000 feet yearly. Shingle imports average 2,229,000,000, page 51, shingle report. These imports to United States markets displace American workmen, decrease American pay rolls, and lessen American commercial activities. That may be meaningless to Mr. Root, but it means forced idleness and distress to thousands of American lumber workmen.

6. Building cost increases from lumbering tariffs: This criticism is really too absurd to answer. It speaks of pyramiding. That's opinion, or guess, whichever it may be called. Better authorities say there will be no price increase to the consumer. However, if a lumber tariff is enacted and becomes completely effective in a cost increase, the statement of a competent and capable critic is more valuable. It follows:

"So, if the tariff was effective, the 8-room house costing \$4,000 would cost only \$4,010 or \$4,012. The 6-room house costing \$3,000 would cost \$3,008 or \$3,009. If he should build a 6-room house, it would cost only \$5 to \$9 additional if the proposed tariff rate should be entirely reflected in the cost of lumber." (Hon. PARK TRAMMELL, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 20, 1930, p. 5676.) The Senator qualified as a building expert, and he is therefore entitled to credence.



It may be well to consider the proposed lumber-tariff clause. It covers dressed lumber or planed on more than one side, and excepting rough lumber from contiguous countries. Normally about one-third of the lumber used in construction is rough. That's not covered if imported from contiguous countries. The tariff therefore equals but two-thirds of the \$1.50, or \$1 per thousand feet average construction on lumber used for building purposes. That makes the lumber tariff easy to figure for any building as an increased cost, if effective in a price increase—just two-thirds proposed tariff rate times thousand feet of lumber in the building.

7. Beneficiaries of a lumber tariff: It is alleged "American workmen will not be benefited or employed one moment longer than they are now through increasing the price of lumber." No one is asking for a lumber-price increase, unless it be the retailers represented by Mr. Root, whose prices average from 40 to 150 per cent above mill prices. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 5683, March 20, 1930. What American workmen ask and want is a chance to labor in the production of American lumber and shingles for American markets, and American lumber and shingle manufacturers are only asking an equal opportunity with foreign production in the manufacture of those products. That's all, and that's a fair request.

It is argued the lumber tariff benefit will go to the timber owner. Labor Department statistics show that the labor cost per thousand feet of lumber in 1927 was \$16.84. That's most of the mill price of American lumber and that will at least go to American workmen. The timber owner can't get that, so labor will be the chief beneficiary. Anyone who knows the value of a pay roll can tell who will get a large amount of the other benefits to be derived from lumber and shingle tariffs.

8. Timber ownership: In this Mr. Root certainly chose a subject with which he shows astonishing lack of knowledge. He should have read page 5492 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, November 13, 1929, and he would have found the 60 per cent claim of ownership. Then he should have read pages 4784-4787, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 5, 1930, and he would have found more interesting information concerning timber ownership and misrepresentations as to timber ownership. Maybe he would then have not presumed to pose as an authority on timber ownership.

9. Foreign timber production advantages: It may be useless to quote from the Tariff Commission's log report, pages 7, 11, and 21, and the shingle report, pages 11, 23, 49, and 72, showing foreign production advantages, because, even after quoting the higher costs, an asserted report that was never made is proffered by Mr. Root to show that Tariff Commission's reports are worthless.

Special attention is asked to the fact that Plain Facts did not show cost statements. It certainly did not. It quoted Tariff Commission's findings as to costs. It was not presumptuous enough to propose to manufacture cost data on which to base false statements in an attempt to disprove the findings of the commission, ascertained from careful investigations. Plain Facts merely assumed the Tariff Commission knew its business, and believes that assumption is tenable.

Mention is made of the "long ton of pea coal and short ton of stove coal." Probably that was intended to refer to log scales in British Columbia and in the United States. The Tariff Commission settles that by saying: "A log 24 feet long and 18 inches in diameter contains, under the Scribner (American) rule, 320 board feet, whereas the same dimensions under the British Columbia scale gives only 311 board feet" (p. 8, commission's shingle report).

The forestry branch of the Canadian Government sustains this finding. See page 146 British Columbia Trade Directory and Yearbook, 1929. So the United States gets the short ton by about 3 per cent.

There is no minimum wage law in Washington. I know; I live there. Nearly all of Washington lumbering labor is paid from \$4 to \$12 per day. I know that, too, because I have signed many checks paying those wages, and I am not guessing like Mr. Root. I also know the minimum wage law of British Columbia has been declared invalid by a Canadian court, and that's no guess.

10. Labor costs in lumber production: Claim is made there is no difference in the wages in British Columbia and Washington and Oregon. Answering this reference must again be had to the same pages of the Tariff Commission's reports just quoted. Also to schedules found on pages 4400-4401 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 27, 1930. Surely the Tariff Commission should know the facts in the case and be better informed than its critic.

Mr. Root wonders where the labor costs per 1,000 feet are found. That's easy. Total lumber production is given in numerous Government publications, as is also total wages paid. Divide total wages by total lumber production and you get labor cost per thousand feet. It's about a fourth-grade problem.

11. Prices of lumber: The critic of Plain Facts did not have much to say concerning this item. Evidently the stated drop in mill prices are admitted. An instance of a decrease in retail price in one city from \$95 to \$75 per 1,000 feet in "C grade edge-grain southern pine flooring" is given. That's a drop of \$20 per thousand feet. A retailer that can afford to cut his price \$20 per thousand feet must have had a

long profit to begin with, and in such an instance one naturally wonders what the war (price) is all about.

Page 5683 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will afford interesting reading on the question of mill and retail lumber prices. It shows the profits of the retail dealer. Maybe that's why the secretary of the Indiana Retail Lumber Dealers' Association is so earnestly opposed to a lumber and shingle tariff.

12. Alleged shingle production advantages: Mr. Root says: "1. The costs are higher in Canada."

The Tariff Commission says: "It will be noted that daily wage rates are lower in British Columbia than in Washington and Oregon" (p. 23, shingle report).

"It appears from the whole five and one-half years covered by Table 5-A log prices in Washington and Oregon have exceeded those in British Columbia, on the average, by \$2.25. In 1925, the year for which cost data were obtained by the commission, the excess was \$2.31; in the first six months of 1926 it had risen to \$2.52" (p. 11).

"Although, as would be expected, piece labor on grades designated as comparable average higher in Washington and Oregon than in British Columbia" (p. 49).

Even on water shipments, the commission says:

"British Columbia shippers sometimes have an advantage in charter rates—not being limited to ships flying American flag," and

"A considerable part of the shipment of shingles from both sides of the line is by water" (p. 72).

But those are merely United States Tariff Commission findings. They do not amount to much in the estimation of Mr. Root.

Again Mr. Root says:

"2. Canadian shingles are predominantly high grade and domestic shingles are chiefly low grade."

The Tariff Commission says:

"Official grading specifications in Washington-Oregon and British Columbia are identical. Moreover, in actual practice, they are approximately equal, whether made on the northern or southern side of the international boundary" (p. 32).

Seemingly to emphasize the fact that American grades equal the British Columbia grades the commission further states: "Most Washington and Oregon mills producing high-grade shingles now turn out as good product as do the British Columbia mills" (p. 72).

American mills also have an abundant supply of high and low grades. See page 5449, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, November 12, 1929.

And Mr. Root says:

"Canadian shingles sell for a considerably higher price than the comparative domestic grades."

The Tariff Commission explains by saying:

"That British Columbia shingle manufacturers pay higher commissions than their Washington and Oregon competitors." (Page 50, shingle report.) In other words, higher powered salesmanship. The British Columbia mills are prosperous, have the advantages, and can afford to pay commissions that would break the American mills. The Canadian advantages are the exact reasons Americans are asking for tariffs.

Mr. Root says the shingle production in the United States was 5,136,000,000 in 1920. Wrong. The production was 6,156,000,000—page 51, Tariff Commission's shingle report, or page 25, Census of Manufactures, 1927. Really, Mr. Root should get some things right, but it seems he can't—or won't.

13. Russian lumber: Plain Facts quoted the statements published by Russian authorities without comment. The Russian publications speak for themselves. They serve notice of the Russian intent. If American interests do not heed them, the American interests will be to blame and will have to suffer the consequences, in which Indiana will share. There's no getting away from that.

When it comes to the asserted prices of the Russian lumber it should be noted the declared valuations of Russian imports for 1928, according to commerce records, were \$22.04 per 100 feet. The Soviet Union Year Book says the return to the shipper was \$14.50. Some one must have received a nice profit if the lumber was actually sold for nearly \$40 per thousand feet, as is claimed. They nearly doubled their money.

The statements on pages 5675-5676 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 20, 1930, are, excepting a paragraph quoted from the Supreme Economic Council of Russia, mostly anonymous and mere boosts for the importation of Russian lumber. They are worth just as much as any other anonymous statement and no more.

However, one fact remains: Russian lumber expansion and production has exceeded anticipation to date. That's an historic fact, well known to all who have made even the slightest investigation of Russian lumber operations.

14. Oriental labor competition: Mr. Root states, "Oriental labor is not a factor in competition between the United States and Canada." Evidently oriental labor was considered the factor that caused the passage of the United States exclusion act, but maybe Mr. Root knows best.

No proponent of the lumber and shingle tariffs admitted the wages of the orientals in Canada were the same as white labor in the United States, and no record will so disclose.

Seeming complaint is made that negroes of the South are employed in the lumber industry. That's too bad. They are American citizens under the laws of the United States, and surely should be granted the right to earn a living by honest toil, even if Mr. Root may not like their working in lumbering operations. Oriental labor in Canadian cedar mills totals 45 per cent of the workers. Page 21, shingle report: Canadian statistics state it amounts to 39 per cent in the lumber mills.

15. Foreign lumber tariffs: If Mr. Root will investigate, he will find Russia now exceeds the United States as a lumber-exporting nation. He will likewise find the United States can not compete in Russian markets; that we ship but little lumber and practically no shingles into Canada; that we lost 33 per cent in exports to Japan in 1929, and have most excellent prospects of losing about 33 per cent more during the coming year; but Mr. Root is evidently not looking for facts; he is merely arguing a question with which he is decidedly unfamiliar and determined not to be convinced of error or mistake in his selfish conclusions.

16. Conservation: What may have been intended as an argument for "conservation" Mr. Root bases on history. The historic statements are in a measure true, but they produce no argument for conservation. Conservation consists largely in closer utilization, and allowing over-ripe timber to rot is nothing but pure waste. When our laws are so changed that timber growing, which might become as legitimate as being a secretary of a retail lumber dealers' association, can be made profitable, perpetuity of forests will become an actuality, as they are in some countries where reforestation and true conservation are practiced, but conservation can never become an actuality as long as foreign low-cost competition forces American devastation and waste, in an effort to compete with the foreign lumber-producing nations, nor can the high standard of American living be maintained if American workmen are to be compelled to equally compete with the peasants of Europe and orientals of Canada.

However, Congressman, if the findings of the Tariff Commission, Government facts and figures, and the statements of able, prominent, and capable United States Senators mean nothing to Mr. Root, there is in reality no need to repeat facts and statistics.

Because of the numerous direct conflicts of proponents and opponents of lumber and shingle tariffs, Plain Facts relied exclusively on the findings of the United States Tariff Commission and other official facts. It is still apparent those authorities are best in determining the need for and advisability of the enactment of lumber and shingle tariff, and they should govern.

Yours very truly,

A. C. EDWARDS,

Secretary, Lumber Industry Tariff Committee, Everett, Wash.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to incorporate an article appearing in a National Grange publication indicating that it is clearly not necessary to enact the debenture in order to solve the farmer's problem but that prohibition has already solved that problem.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I object.

#### TO AMEND SECTION 22 OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a short bill of some 10 lines in length (H. R. 10560), and also the report of the Committee on Banking and Currency thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following bill (H. R. 10560) to amend section 22 of the Federal reserve act and the report thereon of the Committee on Banking and Currency:

H. R. 10560

#### A bill to amend section 22 of the Federal reserve act

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 22 of the Federal reserve act be amended by adding at the end thereof the following language:

"(g) Whoever maliciously, with intent to deceive, makes, publishes, utters, repeats, or circulates any false report concerning any National bank or any State member bank of the Federal reserve system which causes a general withdrawal of deposits from such bank shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall upon conviction in any court of competent jurisdiction be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both."

[H. Rept. No. 1278, 71st Cong., 2d sess.]

#### FALSE REPORTS AS TO CONDITION OF NATIONAL AND STATE MEMBER BANKS, ETC.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, submitted the following report (to accompany H. R. 10560):

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10560) to amend section 22 of the Federal reserve act, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

This proposed legislation is approved by the Secretary of the Treasury and the governor of the Federal Reserve Board, as shown in the following letters addressed by those officials to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, April 4, 1930.

Hon. LOUIS T. MCFADDEN,

Chairman Committee on Banking and Currency,

House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your letter of March 10 requesting an expression of my views with regard to the bill (H. R. 10560) to amend section 22 of the Federal reserve act, so as to make it a crime punishable under Federal law to circulate false reports concerning national banks or State member banks of the Federal reserve system. After consultation with the Federal Reserve Board and the Comptroller of the Currency, it is the view of the Treasury Department that the enactment of this bill would be beneficial to national banks and State member banks as well as to their depositors and stockholders.

The circulation of unfounded statements regarding a banking institution not infrequently causes serious damage to the bank by bringing about a general withdrawal of deposits therefrom, and as a result the stockholders and depositors of the bank may, in case of failure of the bank, suffer financial loss. It is believed that member banks of the Federal reserve system are entitled to have protection under Federal statutes from such statements when maliciously made and with intent to deceive. The proposed law would tend to deter malicious individuals from making or circulating such false statements.

It is understood that a number of States have enacted statutes similar to that proposed in this bill, which apply to banking institutions in those States. It would seem that all National and all State member banks should have the benefit of legislative protection from malicious attacks of this kind against which there appears to be no other effectual means of protection. The proposed bill would also serve to protect against such misstatements which are made in one State concerning a bank in another State, as State laws are not ordinarily effectual against these.

It seems clear that the proposed legislation would be constitutional in view of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Westfall v. United States* (274 U. S. 256), in which the court held in substance that it is within the power of Congress to enact any legislation which Congress deems appropriate for the purpose of protecting National banks and State banks which are members of the Federal reserve system.

Similar legislation has been repeatedly recommended by the Comptroller of the Currency in his annual reports to Congress.

For the reasons which have been stated above, the Treasury Department favors the enactment of H. R. 10560.

Very truly yours,

A. W. MELLON,

Secretary of the Treasury.

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD,  
Washington, March 27, 1930.

Hon. LOUIS T. MCFADDEN,

Chairman Banking and Currency Committee,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Reference is made to your letter of March 10, in which you request an expression of the views of the Federal Reserve Board with reference to the provisions of the bill (H. R. 10560) to amend section 22 of the Federal reserve act so as to make it a crime punishable under Federal law to circulate false reports concerning national banks or State member banks. After a careful consideration of the provisions of this bill the Federal Reserve Board is of the opinion that its enactment would be beneficial to National banks and State member banks as well as to their depositors and stockholders.

The circulation of unfounded statements regarding a banking institution not infrequently causes serious damage to the bank by bringing about a general withdrawal of deposits therefrom, and as a result the stockholders and depositors of the bank may, in case of failure of the bank, suffer financial loss. The Federal Reserve Board feels that member banks of the Federal reserve system are entitled to have protection under Federal statutes from such statements when maliciously made and with intent to deceive. The proposed law would tend to deter malicious individuals from making or circulating such false statements.

The Federal Reserve Board understands that a number of States have enacted statutes similar to that proposed in this bill, which apply to



banking institutions in those States. The board feels that all National and all State member banks should have the benefit of legislative protection from malicious attacks of this kind against which there appears to be no other effectual means of protection. The proposed bill would also serve to protect against such misstatements which are made in one State concerning a bank in another State, as State laws are not ordinarily effectual against these.

It seems clear that the proposed legislation would be constitutional in view of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Westfall v. United States* (274 U. S. 256), in which the court held in substance that it is within the power of Congress to enact any legislation which Congress deems appropriate for the purpose of protecting national banks and State banks which are members of the Federal reserve system.

For the reasons which have been stated above the Federal Reserve Board favors the enactment of H. R. 10560.

Respectfully,

R. A. YOUNG, Governor.

Attention is also invited to the recommendation made by the Comptroller of the Currency to the Congress in his last annual report, which is as follows:

"It is again recommended that a law be enacted making it a criminal offense to maliciously, or with intent to deceive, make, publish, or circulate any false report concerning any national bank or any other member of the Federal reserve system which imputes insolvency or unsound financial condition, or which may tend to cause a general withdrawal of deposits from such bank, or may otherwise injure the business or good will of such bank."

This proposed legislation also was indorsed by the American Bankers' Association, as shown in letter dated February 26, 1930, from its general counsel, reading as follows:

"Your bill \* \* \* to punish libel and slander of national and State bank members of the Federal reserve system has the hearty approval of the American Bankers' Association. Instances are most frequent where malicious persons from a variety of motives circulate malicious stories affecting the standing and solvency of particular banks, which very often have the effect of causing serious injury and loss. The banks certainly need the protection of a Federal statute of this kind which will act as a deterrent to many malicious individuals who, in the absence of a punitive statute, can freely circulate unfounded and injurious statements without fear of punishment."

The following States have enacted a slander and libel of bank act, which acts are, as a rule, stronger and more drastic than the bill H. R. 10560, which this committee has favorably reported to the House: New York, Connecticut, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, Indiana, Kentucky, Illinois, Missouri, Arkansas, Louisiana, Alabama, Rhode Island, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, Nevada, California, Iowa (1929), and Nebraska (1930).

The States which have not passed such an act are as follows: Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Virginia, Tennessee, Mississippi, North Dakota, Minnesota, South Dakota, and Montana.

Statutes passed in 37 States and Alaska.

Although the majority of our States have enacted bank slander laws, any one State law does not reach into another State. Therefore, where false and malicious reports may be circulated from State to State by wire, telephone, or radio, neither State can reach the offender in the other State. There are a number of such instances reported from time to time, and while bank slander bills have been passed in a majority of the States, as indicated above, a man who may be in California and maliciously publishes or circulates information derogatory, for instance, to a bank in St. Louis, the State law of Missouri can not reach this man, nor can any law effective in California assume any jurisdiction.

The only recourse will be a Federal law to reach all cases and it being perfectly apparent that all interests desire and need such a law, your committee respectfully recommends the early passage of this bill.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the address of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATTERSON] I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the address of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATTERSON] he may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT AND WORLD UNREST—UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE UNITED STATES—DANGER SIGNS

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that Members have enjoyed the address just made by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER]. His explanation and analysis of the debenture plan, as revised by the Senate, is the most informative that has been heard in this Chamber.

I am of the opinion that if on days when the regular program has not been arranged in the House of Representatives, or when there is a lull, we could have more hours set aside, under "the

state of the Union" rule, for speeches by different Members on subjects on which they have specialized that the attendance would be good and that all who attend would receive information worth while. Members use the radio for big national subjects when they should be heard in this forum. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER] has given much study to economic and other conditions which now disturb the world. In the course of his remarks, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER] told of some conditions in Russia, but qualified his statement by saying that he knew comparatively little about that country. It is probable that few of us know much about Russia. We can not be sure of what we read about that country, which is now experimenting with an entirely new form of government. Even those who have traveled somewhat in Russia can not be much better informed than some of those Europeans who spend 60 days in the United States and then write books telling all about us.

But we are all well enough informed to know that a great and interesting problem in government is being tried in what was an ancient powerful empire—gone, never to return to the czars.

Inasmuch as the United States Government itself is, so far as time goes, a very young government it behooves us to keep our eyes on the movements in Soviet Russia whether we consider them dangerous or not.

The new Russian government must have credits in other countries; it must receive moneys from other countries. To get the credits and receive the moneys it must sell in the markets of the world all the goods that can be made up from its raw products, coal and minerals from its mines, and foods grown from its fields.

Like the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. RAMSEYER, I know very little about Russia, although I have read and studied all substantial printed matter that I have been able to find on the revolution, the Kerensky government, and its overthrow by the Lenin-Trotsky "dictatorship of the proletariat," the Third International, the development of communism, and the system by which the United States of Soviet Russia has been built up. The next generation will have a story of blood and starvation to read that will rival many of the chapters of the French Revolution. And it is happening right in our time. No one of us can follow the whole Soviet movement.

But we can learn about some movements in detail. We know something about "AMTORG," which is the abbreviated name of the American Trading Organization—a Soviet subsidiary.

I happen to know that agents of Amtorg have been and are at work in the district which I have the honor to represent. The United States headquarters of this organization is, of course, in New York. It has branches in Boston, Chicago, San Francisco, Seattle, and other important cities, and in these cities are the big agents, who make contracts into the millions to buy and sell. The subagents are out in the smaller localities. The big agents contract to buy American machinery and to sell Russian products. As much cash and credit as possible, and trade deals for the balance. The minor agents are about the country engaging American experts in the leading lines of factory production. In the district which I have the honor to represent—the third district of Washington—these agents have been employing young sawmill men; that is to say, saw filers, sawmill builders, and gang-saw men, tallymen, and lumber expert workers of all kinds. They offer good pay and insist on a 3-year contract. They usually engage young men, preferably of north European ancestry.

Many of these young men have gone to Russia by the short route—along the Alaskan coast, passing Aleutian Islands to Vladivostok and thence to the northern interior where there are great forests of pine and other softwoods. These American boys are writing home to the effect that the wage of peasants and workers engaged in getting out logs and working out rough lumber is about \$10 per month; that the conditions are bad; that they are almost in a state of serfdom. The Soviet Government owns the forest or pays a low stumpage, and are said to be erecting 122 American style sawmills, if not more, for the purpose of cutting these cheap priced logs into lumber to sell in the American markets, as well as in the markets of Japan, China, France, and elsewhere. The organization is shipping sawed lumber from Vladivostok to Puget Sound, Wash., and thence down the Pacific coast and through the Canal, and on to ports of France where it is sold for less money than similar lumber can be shipped from Sweden to France. The Soviet organization is also selling its lumber at Poughkeepsie, N. Y., a lumber headquarters promoted by the West and South, so that our fir and the South's pine could reach the great market in the New York trade area—for 250 miles in every direction—the greatest buying area in the world.

In addition to lumber, Russia is planning a great combination to unload peasant-grown wheat into the markets of the

United States. Already some of that wheat has arrived. The peasants, hoping to keep local prices in Russia up, have tried not to grow this wheat, but under force they have been obliged to plant and grow it. If these shipments are continued the Wheat Belt States will have to look out, tariff or no tariff, for that is wheat being grown to be dumped into the United States for the rehabilitation of Russia under its Soviet Government. It is not a question of profits; money is needed for the Soviet Republic, and for the spread of the doctrine of world communism. More information concerning the wheat situation can be learned from the farmers of the Montana State College where Soviet agents spent considerable time. Representative BRIGHAM, of Vermont, can give you further details. It is said that the progress of Soviet Russia next year depends more on the size of this year's wheat crop than on its actual value. The Soviet, through Amtorg, is exporting anthracite coal. Such coal is coming to the United States and competes with our own anthracite. It undersells our coal just a shade, but not cheap enough as yet to benefit our consumers. The trick is to get money for that coal for the benefit of the Soviet system. It is mined over there by men who are forced to mine. Can our coal miners stand that competition?

They can not—any more than the lumber workers in the North Pacific States and in the Gulf Coast States of the South can stand the Russian \$10-a-month man in the new sawmills.

Just a word about lumber conditions. The exports from the north Pacific coast to China, Japan, Australia, and the west coast of South America have declined greatly. There are many causes. Japan is increasing rapidly as a manufacturing island. It is importing raw material, some of it from Russia, manufacturing it, exporting the manufactured article, and taking the profits therefrom. This comes with advance in modern civilization. Where the Pacific coast used to sell the box shooks used all through Asia by the Standard Oil Co. to incase two 5-gallon cans of oil for shipment on the backs of camels Japan now does the manufacturing part of that work. Japan gets the wages that our laborers once received—less wages, of course. Japan's mills make the nails and Japanese laborers benefit by all the operations, and all of that is more competition for the United States export trade. In addition, we have the competition from Canada. Great mills are down by the dozens in western Washington. Unemployment in the district which I represent is fully 5 per cent greater now than it was on the day of the census enumeration—April 2—about a month ago.

One city in my district reports but two sizable lumber camps operating. Other western Washington districts report much unemployment. They fear bread lines this fall. These are conditions to think about. Improved machinery is everywhere in the United States. Electricity and inventive genius are snatching the bread from the mouths of the workingmen. They work faster than the men can adjust themselves to the new conditions.

Mergers and trade combinations cut down chances for employment. Think of the gigantic electric railroad engines hauling trains of 125 to 175 freight cars over heavy steel rails and wonderfully ballasted tracks. These long freight trains cut the need of train crews. Think of the crews—engineers, firemen, conductors, brakemen, and flagmen—that have been laid off all the way from St. Paul to Puget Sound. Shortage of freight to haul—lumber East, wheat, corn, machinery, and automobiles West. Such cargoes East and West are down in volume. More freight crews off. And then the short-line trains, reduced to the minimum by the auto bus and the auto truck. The younger men get the automobile jobs. The trained, experienced railroad men—many of them not yet in the prime of life—see the human junk heap ahead. Great railroad mergers will make this situation worse. Neither this Government nor its financiers and capitalists can afford to reduce the number of steady jobs, for the people have to live.

It is a gloomy picture. The situation has to be met.

I have not touched the situation of the farmers at all. My friend, the gentleman from Iowa, has just told you a lot about their troubles. It may be he has the cure—not cure, but some kind of aid. I hope and pray that the new Farm Board system will work. Give it time. But even that board's plans puts lots and lots of people out of work. They do not want to starve either.

The wholesalers are combining to eliminate wastes and costs. Retailers are combining. Chain stores are on nearly every good corner in every sizeable town in the United States, and in cities north of the Mason-Dixon line we find in between the chain stores the late arrivals from our newest type of immigration running stores, small restaurants, and the like, working, with their families helping, from daylight to midnight. This means more citizens out of work, and it means competition that our old-time individual merchant should not have to meet.

Work, work! They say our people will not work. I tell you, they will. I have cried out a dozen times this winter and spring against unnecessary new immigration. We need no workers from any of the other countries of the world.

Every able-bodied alien now coming either takes work away from some one already here or adds to the unemployed. No one can deny that. The remedy is evident. Admit no more unnecessary immigrants.

Congress should act, and act quickly. Suspend for a while all of the immigration that can be suspended. It is easier to keep them out than it is to get them out after they arrive in these times of overproduction and unemployment. The whole country wants more restriction.

One more picture. I hope it is overdrawn, but I feel impelled to call attention to certain conditions which are foreboding—gang government in the cities!

O gentlemen, if gang government in any city succeeds in breaking down city government the result is confusion.

It will spread to other congested cities. Add all the things I have mentioned—unemployment, mergers, chains, and consolidations, arrival of unemployed alien workers, on account of these arrivals increased feeling against aliens already here and entitled under the Constitution to the "pursuit of happiness" (meaning very often a job), increased use of machinery, arrival of our noncitizen "nationals," the Filipinos, forcing out of white labor by Mexicans, increase in small crimes by boys who have not learned to work, increase in sensational bank robberies, automobile murders, and so forth, crimes of the big bootleggers, the hi-jackers, crimes of the racketeers—all of which are dangerous and might lead on to revolution. I do not predict it. I know that certain forces are driving for it. RAMSEYER has given you one serious angle. I am attempting to give you another. We both agree that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

But the United States is not alone. Most of the world is sick. Much of the present unrest comes from the World War.

The efforts of the Soviet Republic to establish itself in Russia and to spread its communistic doctrines elsewhere, creates a poisonous serum which infects the populations of all countries. It will take steady hands and cool heads to keep modern civilization firm.

The first duty of any government is to extend the benefits of that government to as many people of that government as is possible. If too many of the people of this government "by the people" can not be assured of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," they may feel inclined to overtures for a change of the whole system. But any great change is not done in a day, or a year, or ten years. We want no overthrow.

We should give President Hoover a chance. All of these troubles can not be cured with a magic wand, or with a speech, or with a treaty. The whole job of every citizen is to do his best to help set things right. [Applause.]

In conclusion I quote from Wiggam:

This is a sloganized age; an age of searching not for solutions of social problems but for what Professor James calls "solving words." Democracy, progress, brotherhood, communism, uplift, humanity are not solutions for anything but mere solving words. \* \* \* Just so a thing is democratic or progressive, without any reference to where it may progress toward, it must be right. It has exactly the right name. As James points out, Solomon could control the evil spirits because he knew the right names of all of them. Address an evil spirit by the right name and you've got him. And this age is obsessed with the idea that social evils will yield to the same treatment.

If a "democratic" remedy fails to cure anything, it is proof not that it is the wrong remedy but that it is not democratic enough. Pour in a little "more democracy"! To calculate, to measure, to analyze the psychology of human motives; to add up columns of figures; to calculate standard deviations and coefficients of correlation; this requires hard work and intelligence. It requires intellectual men. It requires men who want to solve things instead of finding solving words for them. \* \* \*

But the faith in solving words in the place of hard-won solutions reigns supreme over this age. There were never so many problems, so many solving words, nor so many people who believed in them. Yet they never have solved anything. Nothing but intelligence and good will, usually extended over long periods of time, ever solved any social problem. (A. E. Wiggam, *The New Decalogue of Science*, pp. 190-192.)

Lothrop Stoddard uses that quotation in his book, *Scientific Humanism*, and says:

Nothing but the application of scientific methods can rescue politics from its present muddling inefficiency. And, in the last analysis, the way to bring this about is by the spread of the scientific spirit and attitude in the public mind. The progressive liberalism and open-mindedness of the scientific spirit is absolutely necessary for a people if it is to succeed in truly ruling itself through rational public opinion. Yet



to-day the public seems actually afraid of science in politics, preferring to trust the "professional" politicians who play the game according to the old rules—with the old results! (Lothrop Stoddard, *Scientific Humanism*, p. 110.)

My colleagues, the two countries to be most closely watched in this present period of unrest and change—economic and social—are the United States of America and the Soviet Republic of Russia. Ours is still a new Government. To it the founders and builders came, many as immigrants; and the other is a still newer government which found its people there. Russia, with its population reduced from 180,000,000 to 150,000,000 in the last 10 years; United States, with a population of 122,000,000, an increase of 17,000,000 in the last 10 years. History is in the making rapidly in both countries, with their governments as opposite as the poles. [Applause.]

#### SECRETARY OF EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KETCHAM). Under the special order the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATTERSON] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I realize that it is very unfortunate for me to come before the House so late in the day to speak at great length with a prepared address on a highly controversial subject.

I made an effort several days ago to get time, but the House has been so busy that I have not been able to get that time until to-day. I would ask for the hour to be vacated if it was not for an engagement I have which would seem to prevent me from speaking on the subject at all for some time.

The question I wish to discuss with you is a highly controversial one, and I am not going to discuss it as a partisan, for it is not a party question.

I do not expect to take my full time, for it is my sincere desire to hurry along and leave out some matters that I have prepared.

This question I feel has a great deal to do with the upbuilding and development of the American Republic. One of the outstanding forces which has brought us to this high state which we enjoy is our American public school, which is an essential part of a democracy where the people are sovereign.

In spite of the splendid advancement we find to-day, we have not had the recognition of the American public educational system which many of its friends desire by having a secretary of education in the President's Cabinet. As was pointed out some few weeks ago by Representative SANDERS of Texas in his speech over the radio, almost all of the great civilized nations have given this phase of their work greater consideration than we have, in placing a minister or secretary of education in the cabinet of the ruler of the country. I here insert a list of these 72 nations as found in Statesman's Year Book for 1929:

#### NATIONS ACCORDING EDUCATION PRIMARY RECOGNITION BY INCLUDING A MINISTER OF EDUCATION AMONG THE CABINET OFFICERS

British Empire: Great Britain, president of the board of education; Northern Ireland, minister of education; the Irish Free State, minister for education; Malta, minister for public instruction; India and dependencies, education, health, and land; Union of South Africa, minister of the interior; Bombay Presidency, minister of education; Federated Malay States, director of education; New South Wales, minister for education; Victoria, minister of public instruction; Queensland, secretary for public instruction; South Australia, commissioner of public works and education; western Australia, chief secretary and minister for education; Tasmania, attorney general and minister of education; New Zealand, minister of education; Canada: Alberta, minister of education; British Columbia, minister of education; Manitoba, minister of education; Ontario, minister of education; Saskatchewan, premier, minister of council, minister of education.

Afghanistan, minister of education.

Austria, minister of education.

Argentina, minister of public instruction.

Belgium, minister of education.

Bolivia, minister of education and agriculture.

Brazil, secretary of justice, interior, and public instruction.

Bulgaria, minister of education.

China, minister of education.

Cuba, secretary of public instruction.

Chile, minister of public instruction.

Costa Rica, secretary of education.

Colombia, minister of public instruction.

Czechoslovakia, minister of education.

Denmark, minister of public instruction.

Dominican Republic, minister of justice and public instruction.

Egypt, minister of education.

Finland, minister of education.

France, minister of public instruction and of fine arts.

Guatemala, minister of public instruction.

Germany: Baden, minister of religion and education; Bavaria, minister of education; Hesse, minister of education; Prussia, minister of education.

Greece, minister of education.

Hungary, minister of public instruction.

Honduras, minister of instruction.

Italy, minister of public instruction.

Japan, minister of education.

Latvia, minister of education.

Mesopotamia, minister of education.

Morocco, grand vizier's delegate for public instruction.

Netherlands, minister of instruction, science, and arts.

Norway, minister for education and ecclesiastical affairs.

Nicaragua, minister of instruction.

Paraguay, minister of worship and public instruction.

Peru, minister of worship and instruction.

Persia, minister of education.

Poland, minister of education.

Portugal, minister of instruction.

Russia, minister of education.

Rumania, minister of education.

Serb, Croat, and Slovene State, minister of education.

Salvador, minister of foreign relations, justice, and instruction.

Siam, minister of education.

Spain, minister of public instruction.

Sweden, minister of education and ecclesiastical affairs.

Turkey, minister of education.

Uruguay, minister of industry and education.

The present public-school system of America has not arrived at its present status without a tremendous struggle. That fight extended over a period of more than 50 years, and the ancestors of some of those who to-day are fighting this bill were fighting the establishment of public schools at that time. Practically all of you know that it was almost the middle of the nineteenth century before public education was developed to any great degree within the great States which compose this country. There were organizations and people who opposed—and I presume they do so yet—the establishment of the public-school system by the States themselves. It is rather interesting to go into the debates of the State legislatures and the hearings on the proposal to establish free public schools for the masses of the people.

In spite of the fact that practically all great American leaders, such as Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, strongly advocated public schools for the masses of the people there were people in the States, as late as the middle of the nineteenth century who bitterly opposed establishing and extending the benefits of the public-school system, even as there are now those in this great country of ours who bitterly oppose the establishment of a department of education, or extending the service of the present Bureau of Education.

I was very much surprised a few days ago when the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MERRITT], on the floor of the House, made the astounding statement that he thought it would be advantageous to the country to abolish the services of the Bureau of Education. This statement, coming from a gentleman of the great and enlightened State of Connecticut, a man who has seen more than three-quarters of a century, has actually given me as much thought and concern as anything that has happened on the floor of this House. It seems to me that the time has come for us to come out in the open and see where we stand on this important question. I think I would be safe in saying that there is hardly a Member of Congress or a Member of the United States Senate who has not received a letter or some written petition—and a great many of us have received thousands of them—requesting that this Congress have an opportunity to vote as to whether there should be established in the President's Cabinet a department of education, and I think it would be a conservative estimate to say that 5,000,000 people, first and last, within the last year, have given expression in writing, by either signing their names to a petition or by writing personally, saying that they favored such a course by the present Congress of the United States.

I doubt if there has been any question before the American people since the great World War which has attracted the attention of so many of our citizens. Now, can we seriously do our duty as Representatives in Congress and entirely overlook the requests and petitions of these people? As for myself, I have only one answer, and that is, personally I can not, and I have no desire or inclination to do so. I doubt not that any other class of legislation having the backing among the masses of our people would have gotten an opportunity to be heard on the floor of the House, and that is what the proponents of this legislation to-day request—that we have a chance to vote on this, on the floor of the House. I approach the discussion of this subject

without any bitterness or partisan feeling. I am ready to acknowledge, and do acknowledge, that men who are just as honest and sincere in their convictions as I am in mine differ from me on this question. As I see it, this is not to be a question of any sectional feeling, or that of prejudice. I find men in the fair Southland who are rather hesitant to establish a department of education, and find it in practically every State in the Union, and then I find large numbers of people in my section, and in every State in the Union, who support this measure, and I believe that the request of these people who wish to have the Congress vote on this question is well founded. As I said, I approach this without any feeling of partisanship or prejudice. I believe that these gentlemen here in the House who have been with me on the committee and know me personally, even though some of them differ with me on this question, would not accuse me of having any kind of prejudice or partisan feeling in this matter. I have a desire to approach the case entirely on its merits and on the plane of statesmanship. Every man has a right to vote as he sees fit, or as his constituents may desire, but when it comes to trying by unseen methods to prevent that free expression, that is a different matter.

Now, what is the situation which we are facing to-day? I will say that in my own judgment the opponents of this measure seem to be divided into two classes. First, some feel that to establish a department of education with increased appropriations and wide opportunity for investigation and service, would tend to interfere with the rights of the States and local people in carrying on their legitimate educational functions. The second class say they oppose the establishment or widening or extending the duties of any kind of bureau in the Federal Government.

Referring to the first class—that this will interfere with the rights of the States, or the rights of the communities, or the rights of families, or of any particular person, in carrying on the education of their children or the education of the children of the State or the community—everyone who has studied this bill knows that it has absolutely nothing written in it, the purpose of which is to do this, for it states very clearly and unmistakably its purpose, which is, to have a secretary of education in the President's Cabinet giving education that recognition to which its friends feel it is entitled. I challenge any person to show me in this bill where any right that any person has at present in his State or local community is restricted or infringed upon by the purpose of this bill. It only widens the influence of the department in its extension and investigating purpose, similar to that of the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, or Labor, at present. I here give a few things which a department of this kind will do and will not do.

It will coordinate the educational activities of the Federal Government. These are now spread through four departments and six independent agencies, with no general directing head.

It will conduct investigations on all educational matters, such as rural education, elementary education, secondary education, higher education, professional education, physical education, including health and recreation, specialized education, training of teachers, immigrant education, adult education, and other phases of the subject.

It will study schoolhouse construction and equipment and furnish the benefits of its research to public schools throughout the land.

It will investigate school accounting systems and administration for the sake of improvement and efficiency.

It will inquire into the training requirements of various businesses, professions, trades, and crafts in connection with courses of study in the public schools.

It will aid in equalizing school advantages throughout the country.

And these are the things that the proposed department will not and can not do:

It will not take one iota of school control from the municipality or the State. In all matters of administration the State and the local government will remain supreme. This is only to assist those agencies of State and community. There will be no attempt to impose the customs or practices of the North upon the South, the East upon the West, or vice versa, in any school questions.

Now as to that great group who claim that they oppose the extending of the duties or work of any bureau, may I say that, if their objections were adhered to in every other line, this objection would be more pertinent, but we are establishing and extending bureaus and services of bureaus in every direction. Hence it would be all out of place to extend every other bureau and widen every other service, and refuse to widen the service of this most important work which has to do with thirty millions of people in whom lies the hope of the future democracy of our country.

Then there is another class who can not find any real objection on the face of things, who say there is no opportunity for constructive work of this kind, and that the States can, and are, doing their work just as well. Some say that the States already have excellent public-school systems and that there is no opportunity wherein a department of education could render any service; some say they are in favor of not spending the Federal money for carrying on an educational enterprise; that it is against the traditions of our country.

Let us see if it is against the traditions of our country. Thomas Jefferson stressed the importance of education; Washington advocated it; there remains a well-founded tradition that Washington left a donation for the purpose, that it might be added to by the Federal Government to establish a great university here at the Capital of the Nation; also, there is not a State in the Union to which the Federal Government has not given large sums of money for educational purposes. The Federal Government has given money to land-grant colleges practically in every State in the Union. The Federal Government gave to many of the States what is known as the sixteenth section fund, which, I am sorry to say, some of them wasted, but which, had they kept it intact, would have been a bulwark to the States to-day in carrying on their educational work. This was given by the Federal Government. We are giving millions of dollars annually in order to carry on education work in the different States, and in spite of that, as time rolls around, people state that they are opposed to the Federal Government giving aid to the schools.

I have seen bills passed here without a record vote, to extend further educational advantages to the colleges and enterprises through their vocational and agricultural education, as well as to the extension service carried on among the people. But strange to say, when it comes to aid for or even the recognition of these 25,000,000 children, almost 90 per cent of whom never see the inside of the walls of a college or university, and almost one-half the balance, until recently, never saw the inside of the walls even of a high school, you will see men upon the floor of the House begin at once to say "I am opposed to granting educational aid or further extending Federal service toward carrying on education."

Let us examine these premises in the light of the facts. Some one has announced that the estimated cost of crime to the Nation is more than \$10,000,000,000 annually. No one would question that this could be largely reduced by the right kind of education, that is, education for service and citizenship, which would put the boys and girls on their way to earning a livelihood, sufficient to enable them to contribute their part to citizenship. Another glaring defect in our educational system which was revealed by the World War is the great number of physical defectives in the schools and without among our people, especially in the rural districts. Statistics show that the lack of health is costing the American people annually \$15,729,925,396; but with the proper education this can be materially decreased and largely done away with. Here in these two items alone is a larger amount than the entire national debt, to work on.

May I pause here to say—having come up from that class of citizens who had no opportunities for an education, and no opportunities to learn anything of health rules, that I personally have seen the tremendous handicap under which these people labor on account of the lack of adequate knowledge and facilities; and I am to-day glad to pay tribute to the splendid work of the Education Bureau and the Department of Agriculture, as they spread knowledge and ideas throughout the country, which in a small way is remedying some of the glaring defects in a system such as I mention.

Another thing which shows the great necessity for this kind of work is the problem of illiteracy, which is widespread among our people. And I may add here that every Republic which makes a boast that its people are sovereign and can exercise that sovereign right owes it to their people to provide education. This is vital to those who are to exercise the franchise, for thousands of them are not able to read the problems of the day. Of course, conditions like these are being mended, but there is still great ground for further improvement.

Then there is the great problem of Americanization, where the proper education of these people and teaching them the principles of American doctrines and American ideals, as well as the English language and the ideals of our Republic, would probably add much to that foundation stone of our Republic and polish it after the similitude of our Constitution. There is a great opportunity for educational service in the extension of vocational education. I know that literally millions of our citizens arrive at that period of maturity without a knowledge of a trade or profession. I recall a time in my own life which brought to me very forcibly the fact that I had no education for a trade or a profession.



When I was about 25 years old, without having had an opportunity for even an elementary education, I recall that I started out to "get a job," as the world would say. I met a man and told him I was looking for work. He asked me what my trade was. Naturally I had to admit I had none; that all I knew was how to plow and hoe and work on a farm; and he said to me in a fatherly manner that any young man who started out in life and left home to get work without a trade or profession had really a hard road before him, and, my fellow colleagues, may I say to-day that I know that many persons who have known similar conditions will agree with me that such a situation as this contributes toward lawlessness and creates a larger number of criminals or perpetual loafers than any of us can imagine.

There is no finer opportunity for the Federal Government to extend its services in helping our people than in the vocational line, in my estimation. Then there is another line which is left more or less to the scientific scholar, and that is the measurement or determination of the kind of education which will be best suited to the individual. Here is a large and beneficial field wherein a Federal department of education might render a splendid service. We have in this twentieth century a great educational unrest; literally millions of our people look toward the colleges and the high schools, not knowing what is best to take or to teach. We realize that it is sometimes suggested that too much of our education is that kind which fails to prepare those who study in the schools for work or for service, another very large field wherein a Federal department of education could make a splendid contribution.

Coming to my last point on this phase of the question, I bring to you a most astonishing fact which, if weighed carefully, should bring to our minds wise and serious reflection. We are told to-day, in spite of the fact that we have in this great educational system of our country invested five billions of capital outlay and are spending \$3,000,000,000 annually, and concerned in this are 30,000,000 of the youth of America, and more than that number of parents who are responsible for their children, and who have the interests of their children at heart, each contributing to carry on this great enterprise, as well as the large and influential class of educators who are carrying on this work, that it has been estimated that only 3 per cent of what is taught in our schools is beneficial for the children to carry with them out into the world.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTERSON. I prefer not.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. But the gentleman undertakes to lay the blame for the failure to pass this bill on the Republican Party. Does the gentleman not know that his party advocates principles which are urged in opposition to this bill, the principles in respect to State rights, yet I favor this bill myself?

Mr. PATTERSON. Oh, there are men in my party I admit, the party of my fathers, who seem to be opposed to this measure and they have done what they could to keep it from coming to the floor of the House, the same as there are in the gentleman's party. I do not claim that it is a party question, but I say that since 1920, and the gentleman will not deny that, the responsibility must lie at the door of the gentleman's party, because they have had a majority of the Members of the House, and to-day if the leaders of the gentleman's party will put it in the program of their party he knows what the result would be, and the country knows what the result would be.

Mr. ALMON. That bill does not provide for any appropriation, does it?

Mr. PATTERSON. This bill does not. I am not speaking about any special bill, but I am speaking of the general principles of the legislation.

Mr. ALMON. Does not the gentleman think we ought to go on and make the appropriations?

Mr. PATTERSON. I am not going to discuss that to-day. The gentleman knows, and the other Members of the House know, how I feel about humanitarian legislation and legislation in the interest of the youth of America.

Surely, my fellow colleagues, to-day as we face this situation, it is time that we awakened from our lethargy and admitted that there is a wide field of service and an opportunity for further extension of Federal aid along the lines of investigation, and of extending to the States and communities, and to all educational institutions everywhere. The service that such a department could render along this line could be used not only by all public institutions but by private institutions and private schools which carry on their work of education, not to restrict the rights of any man or woman to educate their children as they see fit but it is to get a broader and a greater cooperation in carrying on this great educational work. If it is approximately true that more than 95 per cent of our educational effort

is futile and the remaining small percentage is so valuable, here must exist the greatest opportunity in America to-day.

Let us turn to the objection on the other side—those people who claim they do not want to appropriate money to carry on this work—where the interests of 30,000,000 children who are the hope of the American family of to-morrow, and more than 30,000,000 parents who have a wide interest in their children and in the great capital outlay of \$5,000,000,000. Moreover the majority of the American people contribute to-day in another line, through taxes (76 per cent of the taxes of the Federal Government is spent on wars), \$3,000,000,000 are spent annually on war, past, present, and future, and I am as heartily in favor of taking care of those who have fought the country's battles as anyone.

My friends, I wish to raise my voice here—that the first line of defense in my judgment, is far more important than to advance the building of armaments; the future of America and the safety of the country is not in building battleships, but in the hearts and homes of our people; it does not lie in military projects; it does not lie entirely in the renewal of our outlay to carry on war. The safety of the American Republic, and the assurance that that beautiful Star-Spangled Banner which has been pictured so beautifully as waving over "the land of the free and the home of the brave," and the assurance that throughout the enduring years of time that flag may float on, is constructive citizenship. The great hope of safety and democracy lies in the first line of defense, which is among the people and American children; and I repeat, not alone the \$3,000,000 which is spent annually for war purposes. But why not spend several millions to carry on education as well as to appropriate millions to carry on a process of eradication of insects and diseases of cattle and hogs, and stamping out diseases of plants, without even an approach to a record vote in this House? But just the minute it is suggested that we extend and expand an educational service, the cry comes from afar, "We don't believe in that; we can not afford to spend several millions in education, or it is unconstitutional," or something to that effect.

The appropriation for the Bureau of Education this year is \$1,526,331. Of that sum \$1,090,000 is spent in Alaska. We are expending for the same fiscal year \$16,000,000 plus to take care of the forests of the United States, and around \$500,000 by the Bureau of Education in the United States proper. We are expending \$5,000,000 plus to take care of plants. We are expending \$11,000,000 plus to take care of animals. The appropriation for the Interior Department, in which we put that little Bureau of Education, is \$283,000,000 for the next fiscal year, and the Bureau of Education gets but \$1,526,331, and over \$1,000,000 of it, as I said, is expended in Alaska.

Not a gentleman on this floor would be more zealous in protecting the rights of the States and the communities than I. And I would not vote for any bill that would restrict any man's personal rights, and there is nothing in this bill to restrict a pupil or prevent his attending any school that he wishes to attend.

Mr. Speaker, may I say the statement of the gentleman from Connecticut raises the battle cry. I wish to make my position clear here to-day, my colleagues, I feel that the lines are drawing. This question we have with us, and it is going to remain with us until we have a settled national policy of this Government, that in spite of the fact that we have millions of people who are neglected in their health education, neglected in their literary education, whether we shall give our schools this recognition or not. We have made great accomplishments in our educational field. Our motives are good, yet our system is far from perfect and could be added to so adequately by help from a national department of education. This fight is to continue until it is definitely decided whether we shall spend money for these other things and refuse to spend for this important educational work. The question is, Shall we refuse to establish a department of education in the President's Cabinet, and recognize education as a great national asset and something which will receive the national sanction of the Federal Government, or whether we shall continue to put it off in a little bureau in the Department of the Interior, or, as the gentleman from Connecticut said, "abolish it altogether."

There are yet other reasons why it is important to the national welfare. Some one has said that by education and training of our people our national income is made about five times as large as it ordinarily would have been by computing the annual interest on our capital wealth, and that every day spent in self-improvement is worth more than \$10 to the person using that time for self-improvement. Some one has figured out that a high-school education is actually worth on an average \$78,000 in cash during the lifetime of the recipient, and that a college

education is worth \$150,000. Surely adding to the national income by a great asset like this challenges the very best that is in us, and I trust that every man and every woman shall see the wisdom of this, and I hope that we shall not continue in being lethargic toward this great question when the great masses are concerned.

This question is one of such great importance to the youth of our land and the hope of America's future citizenship, and that in view of the fact that when we appropriate billions of dollars here in Congress I hope we do not continue to neglect the first line of defense, which is the American youth. This important question faces us to-day. To return to the purpose of this bill, as I stated previously, it is not the purpose of this bill to control education of any State or any community or any person. It is not my purpose in advocating this to restrict any man's or woman's right to educate their children as they choose; but it is my purpose to get that national recognition to our educational system and extension of that service to the States and the communities and to the homes of the American people.

We stand to-day well into the enlightened twentieth century, and the world stands literally astounded at our great progress, the many inventions and luxuries which life has brought us, as well as the intricacies and the scientific apparatus and scientific procedure which the age has ushered in. We also stand removed only a little more than a decade from the most gigantic World War and struggle in the world's history. All of these bring new complications and new challenges for duty, citizenship, and training. No other age has brought forward so forcefully the necessity for training as is brought to us to-day. This is particularly true of the great country of which we are citizens—that country which although young has produced such a long line of illustrious men and women and given to the world so many splendid principles of democracy and ideals of democratic government, a country whose spirit has been that of the pioneer, and has through struggle brought us to this threshold of opportunity for leadership in the world of mankind.

We are literally thrilled to-day as we review the great accomplishments of this Republic, from the time when under the leadership of George Washington, of Virginia, our ancestors marched from Lexington and Concord, through the bloody snows of Valley Forge, to victory at Yorktown. During these trying years the immortal pen of Thomas Jefferson gave to the world the Declaration of Independence, which is to us our charter of liberty.

Then came that long period illuminated by so many distinguished men and women, which placed our country well on its feet, and it spread out from the Atlantic to the Pacific under the leadership of men like Alexander Hamilton, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, James K. Polk, and many others, until a little past the middle of the nineteenth century we encountered the sad experience of the great Civil War. We were led through that by God, and under the leadership of the greatest and most shining and most illustrious statesman which modern times has given to the world, and whose name stands second to none for rugged honesty and devotion to public duty and to the ideals of the American Republic, as well as his great humanitarian spirit, which will shine with more and more luster until time shall be no more. Again, as he said, the better angels of our nature touched us and we stood reunited under that blessed flag the "Star-Spangled Banner," which flag we to-day would be delighted in taking the field for in a reunited country which is neither North, South, East, or West. Then the wonderful period of development until we stepped forth, one might say, under the leadership of the Congress rather than under the leadership of the President, to become a world power as none can deny; whenever we took up arms in the Spanish-American War, it meant breaking away from the past. We have never gone back, we never could go back to the old isolation which characterized us for 100 years. Then next, under the leadership of that great typical American statesman, Theodore Roosevelt, we had that period of awakening that national spirit wherever the value and the benefit of conservation, not only of our national resources but of American ideals and principles, which were brought most forcibly to our people.

Then, as I have already mentioned, we had that great conflagration, where under the leadership of that great crusader, Woodrow Wilson, we went forth to make the world safe for democracy. And now to-day, with all of those achievements, all those splendid inheritances, where do we stand? We find that the Government has grown as from time to time new demands have been made upon it for the expansion of its work and the dispensing of its services in every field of human endeavor.

We find established a Department of Agriculture, assisting the farmers of the Nation and the great agricultural interests; we find the Department of Labor, to assist the laboring man

with his manifold problems, all of which I am in favor of. In all this splendid work that has been done to-day we find one field for which there has been a steady demand throughout the years for the Government to extend the same aid and cooperation, but for some reason those opposing this policy have succeeded in pushing it off from time to time; as I have said, where we find representing 12,000,000 or more laborers in our country the great Department of Labor, with an efficient head; we find representing several million manufacturers of our country the great Department of Commerce, with an efficient head, spending millions of dollars; we find representing the great farming class of our people, about 6,000,000 of them, a great Department of Agriculture, with its many bureaus, doing splendid work for the farmers; but to represent an investment of \$5,000,000,000 in school property and an outlay of \$3,000,000,000 annually, with 30,000,000 children and with more than that number of parents and 1,000,000 splendid, patriotic teachers, we find a little bureau down in the Department of the Interior.

And this is what the leaders of the party in power offer us to serve the national interest of education in this great scientific age, when we are extending the service of government into every field of human endeavor from looking after chinch bugs in California to spending nearly \$100,000,000 in the Department of Commerce to help the trader and manufacturer. In this great enlightened age, when changed and restless conditions demand the highest and most scientific training known to history, the country wants to know, and should know, why this important legislation has been sidetracked for the past 10 years.

And I am one of those Members who feel that in view of past utterances of party platforms and leading citizens that the leaders of the party in power should let the country know their attitude toward this legislation. I believe no one who knows the facts will deny that it has been the victim of the greatest strangling in the history of party government.

So to-day, my colleagues, we come to appeal to you to give proper recognition to education by establishing a department of education in the President's Cabinet; we come to you to ask why this has been denied. Why is it that all other organizations, all other industries and businesses of our country, can have a man to sit around the table with the great President of the United States and speak for them while education alone has no such voice? It would be interesting at this time, I think, to review the history of this legislation; some of you would probably be surprised to know who first introduced a bill to establish a department of education—none other than that great and good man James A. Garfield, while he was a Member of the House of Representatives; at that time this measure was supported most vehemently by no less a person than Senator Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts; they finally turned it aside and established a bureau in the Department of the Interior, and that has been brought forward to the present day. We have had a number of bills introduced by gentlemen from different sections of the country proposing a department of education—until after the Great War these bills poured into both Houses of Congress. Many farseeing men recognized the importance and the necessity of having an educational representative in the President's Cabinet.

At hearings literally great numbers of people and organizations appeared for this measure. A few appeared against it, and for some reason during the 10 years the leaders of the party which has been in power have never permitted Congress to vote on these bills. It has been stated time and again that Congress was overwhelmingly in favor of such legislation, but by methods which were in vogue in the House of Representatives, I am told we have never been permitted to bring the bill upon the floor of the House for discussion. Those who have opposed these bills seem to have created a continuous fear on the part of those who had the responsibility for this legislation, therefore we have not been permitted to get anywhere. What is the situation to-day? To-day we find ourselves, after 10 years of delay, still with poor prospects for any action before we have another election. I am informed by those who sponsored this legislation in former years that we have had to face the same identical situation as now; that we would not bring it up before election, and we have postponed it from time to time. To-day we have what is known as a commission to study the feasibility of what the Congress should do along the lines of education. Without any undue criticism of anyone, and without any idea as to how the commission might report, I do know that it is not necessary for anyone to tell Congress what it is proper for it to do regarding a matter of this kind, in which so many millions of people are interested.

I assume, to start with, that there are good, honest people who differ with my views on this legislation, and if they wish to vote against the bill or for it, I accord them the same honest



conviction as I take for myself; but we do feel that it is not fair, in view of the demands of our people, to prevent this legislation by what is known as "gag rule" or unseen pressure or by an effort to select a committee which is known to be opposed to the bill, or any other kind of rule which prevents the bringing of such legislation before the Houses of Congress and let the Members who represent their constituents vote as they see fit on this legislation.

This is not prejudice. I am for this legislation, and not with any purpose to restrict any man's right to send his children to any school he pleases, but with the firm purpose and belief that we should give education the recognition of a place in the Nation's councils.

I have no desire to have any kind of a national organization which will dictate to anyone as to his rights, or the right to send his children to any school he wishes to, and I would not support any proposition which would tend to take the control of education out of the hands of the States and the local people. But there is not an iota of anything in this bill which attempts to do so, but it is giving it that recognition to which it is justly entitled. It is giving the question of education that broad field in cooperation with the States and communities, and also the private institutions as well, that they may render more efficient and constructive service in their particular field and render it unhampered and unrestricted. There would be no more obligation for any school or community or any State to avail itself of the benefits of the investigations or findings of the department of education than there would be for the farmer to use Paris green on his potatoes because the Department of Agriculture said that Paris green would kill bugs. As I have previously stated, I do not argue that this is a party question, but I do say this: That no one can deny that the major responsibility for legislation rests with the party in power, and they would get the lion's share of the credit for this act, and no one can deny that if the present political party leaders—and I am going to make this assertion in as fine a spirit as I can; I say it without any feeling of partisanship; no one can accuse me of that, as my first great political ideas were drawn from the life of Abraham Lincoln, to whom might be credited the founding of that great political party which has produced so many splendid and patriotic men and women, many of whom we have with us to-day, and many of them are for this legislation. If the leaders of the party in power wishes action on this bill, they can have it. Not one of the leaders would stand here, those who hear me to-day, and say that they championed the cause of this bill in their program of legislation, and they have not been able to drive it out for 10 years.

So whatever blame there is in keeping this legislation from the floor lies at your door and the leaders of the party in power. I have no more doubt in my mind that if the steering committee of that great political party which is in power were to get together to-morrow and decide that they wanted legislation on this measure at this session of Congress they could have the bill before the House and have it before the Senate within a few weeks, and also before the President for his signature. But they do not do this, and make no move in that direction; so they naturally must admit that the responsibility rests squarely on the shoulders of those who are in power and plan the program for their failure to do so.

My friends, the country knows where the responsibility lies, and I do not mean that all the opponents of this bill who have sought to keep it from the floor of the House are members of the party in power. But, of course, there are 14 members of the committee which has this measure before them on the Republican side, while the Democrats have 7, and may I add here that in spite of the zeal of some to prevent this I would not be surprised that a vote of that committee would now put this bill on the calendar; and you have every facility for action excepting the will. If you would, you could champion it to-morrow and put it on the program for new legislation. You know what the result would be, and the country knows what the result would be. Therefore, in defeating this measure and keeping it from coming before the House, whatever virtue there is in it, the major credit must be given to the Republican Party; and whatever fault there is for not allowing this Congress to vote on this bill that fault must rest on the shoulders of the Republican Party.

What we want in this Congress is the right to vote as to whether, when these 10 men sit around the President's table, when times are good or when times are bad, in considering the strain and struggle for all the great industries and great enterprises of our country, and the different occupations comprising this great population, we ask for a man to sit there who can speak for citizenship, for the schools, and the citizens of to-morrow. This is, as I said before, our first line of defense; the

safety of our country and the glory of that flag would be more secure.

I reiterate that the security of the American Republic is not alone in her great navies, which ride the seas with their masts pointing skyward; it is not in the great armies, which come marching, tramp, tramp, tramp; not these alone make secure this great Republic; the first line of defense is the training and development of its citizenship and training the young people how to become the citizens of to-morrow.

There are so many things which such a department could do. I would not at this time attempt to go further into this. It has been so well set forth in so many splendid speeches; it has also been set forth that practically every country in the world has either a secretary or minister of education in the ruler's cabinet. We stand alone almost in not giving that recognition to our education, and I again repeat, I doubt that any other question before the American people has ever received reinforcement by so many requests from the hands of the people, whether by petition or letter asking for action. I have no doubt that more than 5,000,000 people in the past year have requested Congress through their legal representatives by petitions or letters written directly to the Representatives or Senators asking them to get this bill out of committee and get it before the House of Representatives, and in this connection may I not add that these men and women are going to be heard, and don't you believe for one moment they do not know where the responsibility lies.

In addition to that, a great number of organizations have endorsed this legislation. The total list of organizations represent 29,000,000 of such great organizations as the American Federation of Labor, the National Education Association, National Association of Parents and Teachers, Federation of Women's Clubs, General Grand Chapter Order of the Eastern Star, Young People's Christian Associations, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, National Council of Jewish Women, National Council of Religious Education, Supreme Council of Scottish Rite Masons, 44 State organizations of the National League of Women Voters, in addition to the District and one Territory, and many other organizations, all of whose names will be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

#### NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS SPONSORING A DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

National Education Association; American Federation of Teachers; American Federation of Labor; National Committee for a Department of Education; National Congress of Parents and Teachers; General Federation of Women's Clubs; National League of Women Voters; Supreme Council, Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, Southern Jurisdiction, United States; International Council of Religious Education; National Council of Jewish Women; National Woman's Christian Temperance Union; American Association of University Women; National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs; General Grand Chapter, Order of the Eastern Star; National Women's Trade Union League; National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations; National Federation of Music Clubs; American Library Association; American Vocational Association; Woman's Relief Corps; Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America; National Kindergarten Association; American Home Economics Association; American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association; American Nurses' Association; Osteopathic Women's National Association; National Council, Junior Order of United American Mechanics of the United States of North America; Service Star Legion (Inc.); Educational Press Association of America; Woman's Missionary Council, Methodist Episcopal Church, South; Women's Homeopathic Medical Fraternity.

These, as I said, represent more than 29,000,000 splendid citizens of our country.

Let the case stand on its merits and give the people a voice, but do not try to kill it with guile, because it is controversial, but let us vote openly on the matter. Why is it that we can not get an opportunity to vote on this bill? I leave that for each Member of this great legislative body to answer for himself. The reason is obvious. It has been explained by some of those gentlemen who have spoken before. It is not my purpose to go further into the discussion of what the bill does and what it does not do—but I repeat again that it has no tendency to set up in the President's Cabinet an administrative function in relation to the schools of the States. There is not a particle of foundation in any argument of any man who opposes this bill because there is something in it that he thinks has to do with the administration of education in the States and the communities. It would be a splendid service which such a department could render in its investigation and extension by having this great work given recognition in the President's Cabinet. Every school or person would be free to use this service or leave it alone, just as he is free to use the service of the Department of Agriculture or the Department of Commerce or the Department of Labor, or leave it alone.

I challenge those who are opposed to the bill and who try to point out some of its objectionable features to come before the House and in their own time show where the bill in any way restricts the rights of a State or community to carry on its education. They have not done it so far. The speeches which have been made have been on the other side and in my opinion no legitimate objection is made. Once in a while a Member will rise up and say that he believes in State rights. I believe in State rights, but I know that the establishment of a department of education no more invades the rights of a State than the establishment of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, in closing may I say that in this great age, with the many demands which beset us as citizens and country, and since our great Government has recognized this by extending the service of the Government literally into every field of human endeavor, and properly so, then why not give education the same recognition or a similar recognition to that which has been given those other great enterprises and scopes of work?

Members of the Seventy-first Congress, I appeal to you to help us get action on this bill. I especially appeal to the steering committee of the majority party. You have 14 out of 21 members on the House committee; you could get action if you wished. I plead with you not as a partisan but as an humble Member who recognizes the great, eminent, and patriotic men and women of the party of our Lincoln to give us a chance to make some headway on this legislation either by holding hearings or getting behind this legislation and reporting it to this House for action.

I appeal to you in the name of the nearly 30,000,000 splendid citizens of every State and congressional district in this great country who have petitioned you or indorsed this legislation. Without any prejudice or thought but the good of my country and every citizen and every cause for good, with no intent or purpose to impose anything or any idea on anyone contrary to their own personal views pertaining to their own affairs or controlling the ideas or plans of any school, person, State, or community; and every one who knows this bill knows there is no effort to do so.

I appeal in the name of the 30,000,000 youth of America, many of whom are now neglected and are without health education, literary instruction, educational guidance, and many other needs which I myself experienced in the dark years of suffering and deprivation. I appeal to you in the name of these 30,000,000 children who are the hope and future of America.

I probably feel this thing deeper than most anyone else, since I was unable to attend high school until I was 30 years of age. I know the problems of the poor and the neglected. I know the kind of educational facilities they have and the meager advantages of health, education, or things of that kind. I appeal to you in their names, and many of them can not speak for themselves through organization or otherwise.

I appeal to the people of the country, especially those who have sponsored this legislation, to carry on, and that we may all take increased devotion to the cause for which so many splendid and patriotic men and women have given so much of effort and consecration, and go forward with that great asset, so that education of our country shall be recognized nationally by having a spokesman in the President's Cabinet, and that every school, private, public, or any person who may be interested in any educational cause will have the advantage of this service with no right restricted or curtailed, and with no more obligation to use this service than there is for a farmer to use the service of the Department of Agriculture, but a service so valuable that all will welcome this long-needed aid.

In my further appeal to you and the country I think it not out of place here to quote from some distinguished authorities who have expressed themselves on this important question.

Ex-President Coolidge in his message December 6, 1927:

For many years it has been the policy of the Federal Government to encourage and foster the cause of education. Large sums of money are annually appropriated to carry on vocational training. Many millions go into agricultural schools. The general subject is under the immediate direction of a commissioner of education. While this subject is strictly a State and local function, it should continue to have the encouragement of the National Government. I am still of the opinion that much good could be accomplished through the establishment of a department of education and relief, into which would be gathered all of these functions under one directing member of the Cabinet.

Late Senator Woodbridge N. Ferris in an undelivered speech:

The "hewers of wood" and "carriers of water" have never received a square deal. Millions and millions of dollars have been given to educational foundations; millions and millions of dollars have been given to colleges and universities; but very little effort has been made to take care of the great majority who can never hope to enroll in a high school. The real educational problem for America to solve is the problem of

enabling the rural schools to provide a practical education through satisfactory courses of study, through adequate equipment, through the best methods of instruction, through the employment of well-trained teachers.

Hon. S. M. N. Marrs, State superintendent of Texas:

We have a Secretary of Agriculture, and I believe in that department. It is promotional; but the Secretary of Agriculture has never attempted to standardize the method of raising cotton in the South; he has never undertaken to standardize the method of raising wheat in the West; but through that great department information has been disseminated in the agricultural sections and the localities have been stimulated until the country is more prosperous on account of the workings of that department. And so I may say of Commerce and Labor. What is the department of the Government recognized by the world as standing for the cultural and the spiritual among our people? I submit this, gentlemen, as one thought that has not been developed by any other person that I have heard discuss this question.

My colleagues, you may talk resources, and no one takes more pride in the rich resources of our country than I, but may I say that our greatest assets are not our great mines with their layers of coal, iron, gold, and many other products, nor our great oil fields with their great gushers, nor our great forests and fertile fields extending for thousands of miles, nor our rivers and water power, as great as all these are, neither is it our great cities and factories with all their material wealth, but our greatest asset is the youth of America; here is the first line of defense, and as that great and eminent teacher of President Hoover, Dr. David Starr Jordan, once said: "America is safe so long as we have American ideals."

Then, my colleagues, the safety of this great country when we have passed on, lies in the proper training and fitting of the youth of America to-day for the tasks of to-morrow.

When we have done this, my colleagues, regardless of our other mistakes, those of us who are called to be partners at these sacred shrines and altars where Garfield and many others have tread, and when we are called to look back on the past, illuminated by the heroic examples of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, Roosevelt, and Wilson, we shall feel a new challenge to duty, country, and citizenship, to give the best that is in us to this great heritage of heroism and valor, and then we shall so watch and so serve that when the bugle sounds at the dawn of the day that we shall be ready to break camp and march at the sound of the trumpet. Then let us go again and again unto that limpid fountain of patriotism and perform there a solemn lustration and return divested of all the sordid and selfish impurities of life and think alone of our God and our country. [Applause.]

#### THE SILVER TARIFF

Mr. ARENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter addressed to me on the matter of the silver tariff.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nevada asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter addressed to him on the subject of the silver tariff. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

EUREKA SECRET-CANYON MINES (INC.),  
Washington, D. C., April 29, 1930.

HON. SAMUEL S. ARENTZ,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The attention of yourself and your colleagues in the House of Representatives is respectfully invited to the very serious condition the silver-producing industry in the United States is in at present, due to the ruinous competition of silver produced in foreign countries by peon labor, at peon standard of wages and living, as well as the threatened dumping of the world's surplus supply of silver in the United States, due to India going on a gold basis, which calls from circulation the silver coinage used in India. The same condition prevails in other countries.

This condition not only affects the rich silver-producing districts in Nevada, but the silver-producing districts in our Western States. This fact was brought to public attention in the Senate on March 19, 1930, by Senator REED SMOOT, of Utah, who said:

"I recognize that the mining industry is at a standstill, and particularly the silver mines of the country. England is forcing India to a gold standard. As those silver coins come out of circulation they are melted and exported all over the world, but America is the principal place to which they are sent."

At the same session of the Senate, Senator KEY PITTMAN, of Nevada, further stated:

"Great Britain has demonetized silver. They have not only demonetized silver, not as we do in the United States and in Mexico and in other places, but they are destroying silver. Every time a silver rupee comes into a bank in India it is immediately sent to the mint and melted up and the silver shipped out of the country. It is dumped on



the market of the world without regard to price, because Great Britain would sooner throw that silver in the sea than have it remain in India."

Senator AUGUSTUS SWANSON, of Virginia, further stated:

"I look upon silver now as absolutely a commodity; it is no longer money, it is like wheat, corn, oats, iron, and other things. India proposes to dump her silver in all parts of the world. Our market is accessible to India, and I have no doubt the vast reservoir of silver in India will be dumped here, so that the price of silver may go to 30 cents an ounce or even less."

Senator TASKER L. ODDIE, of Nevada, further stated:

"I am very familiar with the depressed condition of the silver-mining industry and of the benefits we all hope and believe will come to that industry from the adoption of this amendment. Not alone to the silver-mining industry but to the industries of copper, lead, zinc, and gold, and the mining of other metals, because silver is a by-product in the mining of many of the metals I have mentioned."

The passage of the amendment will do much toward solving the unemployment problems in our Western States where mining is practically the sole industry. By reason of increasing the consuming and buying power of the citizens of the silver-producing States, of those materials which are produced in the non-silver-producing States, production would be increased and unemployment in the nonsilver-bearing States would be curtailed.

The passage of the amendment would tend to stabilize the silver-producing industry in the United States, which would be reflected in the fabrication and distribution, with the possibility of developing additional uses for this useful metal which is now largely used in the production of luxuries. The stabilization of the silver-producing industry in the United States would have a favorable influence on the silver situation throughout the world.

Furthermore, the passage of the amendment would tend to further develop the vast areas of mineralized lands in the United States, thereby adding to the Nation's wealth.

This office is in receipt of a letter from the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, indorsing the proposed amendment and advising of the active support of that organization in urging its passage. The International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers is the representative organization of the workers in the mining industry. Writing specifically on the proposed amendment to place a 30-cent per fine ounce on the importation of silver, President James B. Rankin, of Anaconda, Mont. says:

"I fully realize the necessity of improved conditions for the mining industry. I have asked our local unions to assist by requesting them to use their influence to secure the enactment of the proposed amendment." Mr. Edward E. Sweeney, the secretary-treasurer of the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, writes his office as follows: "As the time appeared short for our organization to get out a letter and send to all of the Congressmen, I have wired Mr. Matthew Woll, vice president of the American Federation of Labor, to appear before the joint committee which is handling the tariff proposition, in behalf of the 10,000 organized miners and smeltermen. I also stated that many of the mines were shut down, many working on reduced time and wages had been reduced 25 and 75 cents per day in many of the silver mines."

Thus it would seem that the passage of the amendment will not only save one of our important industries from ruination but it will have a beneficial influence on industrial conditions throughout the United States. As every industry is endeavoring to help overcome the bad effects of the period of adjustment which we are just going through, the passage of this amendment will make possible the silver industry's substantial contribution to the Nation's prosperity.

This condition should be of interest to all of your colleagues as it directly or indirectly affects every section of industry in the United States.

It is hoped that your active support of this amendment by informing the Congress of its importance will relieve the predicament of the silver-producing industry in.

Very truly yours,

H. SERKOWICH, President.

#### THE OIL SITUATION

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] for 10 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General of the United States should be removed from office. He has delivered our country, lock, stock, and barrel, into the hands of the monopolies and trusts. He is failing and is refusing to enforce the antitrust laws. He is using his office as an agency of convenience for the large oil companies and other big concerns of America. He has been a great disappointment to the people. Harry Daugherty, former Attorney General, successfully used prohibition as a smoke screen to hide his many failures of duty.

Mitchell is now attempting to use law enforcement as a smoke screen to prevent the people from noticing his failure to enforce the antitrust laws. Prohibition should be enforced and not used as a smoke screen for a public officer to hide his failure of duty.

The oil companies of the United States were organized into a trust by the Federal Trade Commission last fall at St. Louis, Mo. This trust agreement has evidently been acquiesced in if not affirmatively approved by the Attorney General. Tomorrow, May 1, 1930, the oil companies are starting an increase in price of gasoline of 1 cent per gallon. It will soon be effective all over the United States and by all oil companies. This agreement to raise the price of gasoline 1 cent per gallon is the outgrowth of the trust organized by the Federal Trade Commission and will be followed by similar increases. This increase of price is unnecessary, as the oil companies are now making enormous profits, and it is nothing less than a tax on the people. There were 13,400,180,162 gallons of gasoline used last year by motor vehicles in the United States.

An increase of 1 cent a gallon will mean that the American public will have to pay \$134,001,801.62 additional for that amount of gas this year, and more gas than that will be consumed. It means a direct assessment against every automobile owner of from \$5 to \$10 a year. The Attorney General of the United States knows about this violation of the antitrust laws. He has failed and refused to prosecute the conspirators. Not only is he permitting the oil companies to violate the antitrust laws but big business generally is permitted to violate them.

It will be noticed that the Attorney General never asks for a criminal indictment against violators of the antitrust laws. If any action is taken at all, it is usually by injunction. By pursuing this course if the conspirators against the public lose they are assured that they will not have to go to jail or pay a fine. If he were sincere in trying to enforce the antitrust laws, he would ask the grand juries of the country to indict these conspirators representing giant trusts and monopolies.

Sir Henry Deterding, head of the Royal Dutch Shell Co., announced a few days ago that there was an end to the oil war. It is generally known that the oil war ended when the Federal Trade Commission organized the Oil Trust last fall. Wall Street bankers are letting the Royal Dutch Shell interest have all the money they want, and that company is rapidly taking charge of the oil industry in America. I predict that it will not be 10 years, if the present progress of acquisition continues, until the Dutch Shell Oil Co. will absolutely control the oil industry in America, and then we will be forced to pay tribute to the English Government on every gallon of gasoline purchased in America. Only a few days ago I noticed where seven Wall Street bankers were letting the Royal Dutch Shell Co. have \$40,000,000 to promote its business. Many other large bond issues have been floated for this company and its subsidiaries.

I called the Attorney General's attention to the fact that the cottonseed-oil companies had organized an illegal conspiracy and compelled the farmers of the South to sell their cottonseed for \$75,000,000 less than the market price last fall. The Department of Justice investigated my charges and evidently found them to be true.

The conspirators were permitted to keep the money they had illegally taken from the farmers, but were told by the Attorney General "to go along and not defraud the farmers any more." [Applause.]

#### SPECIAL REPORT ON THE DISEASES OF CATTLE

Mr. BEERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution from the Committee on Printing.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### House Joint Resolution 191

To provide for the printing, with illustrations, and binding in cloth of 130,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of Cattle

*Resolved, etc.,* That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and is hereby, authorized to have printed, with illustrations, and bound in cloth 130,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of Cattle, the same to be revised and brought to date, of which 90,000 shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 25,000 for the use of the Senate, and 5,000 for the use of the Department of Agriculture; and to carry out the provisions of this resolution there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$60,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this another bill to print more of these cattle books or horse books? We have been printing these books at least since 1902.

Mr. BEERS. How many prints have there been?

Mr. MICHENER. I have no idea, but there were many of them in the document room five or six years ago that had not been drawn out.

Mr. BEERS. I want to say to the gentleman that I brought this matter up probably a year ago and the same objection was offered at that time, that there were a great number in the document room, but they have now been exhausted, and there is more demand for the book than any document I know of.

Mr. MICHENER. What will this cost the Government?

Mr. BEERS. The cattle book will cost \$55,000.

Mr. MICHENER. That is just for the book itself, and of course it will cost a number of thousands of dollars to send them out under the frank.

Mr. BEERS. There is a great demand for them.

The SPEAKER. From the reading of the resolution, the Chair observes it carries a direct appropriation, which destroys its privilege.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not want to assume the responsibility, but it does seem to me this committee should not bring in a bill of this kind at this hour with only six Members on the floor.

Mr. BEERS. I may say to the gentleman that I have been here all the afternoon trying to get this bill up, but have not had a chance to bring it up.

Mr. MICHENER. This is a campaign year and everybody likes to send out books.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania informed the Chair that this was a privileged resolution. The Chair does not think it is privileged.

Mr. BEERS. This is the way similar resolutions have been passed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not feel he should recognize the gentleman to submit a unanimous-consent request under these circumstances. The Chair understood this was one of the ordinary privileged resolutions; on the contrary, it carries a large appropriation, and of course is not privileged, because the Committee on Printing has no authority to report a resolution carrying an appropriation. Under the circumstances the Chair will ask the gentleman to withhold his request for the time being.

Mr. BEERS. I withdraw the request, Mr. Speaker.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—CLAIM OF LI YING-TING, A CITIZEN OF CHINA (S. DOC. NO. 139)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report of the Acting Secretary of State requesting the submission to the Congress of a claim against the Navy Department submitted through the American consul at Nanking, in behalf of Li Ying-ting, a citizen of China, for the deaths of four members of the claimant's family resulting from a collision between the claimant's junk and the United States naval vessel *Hart* on the Yangtze River on July 3, 1925.

I recommend that, as an act of grace and without reference to the question of the legal liability of the United States, an appropriation of \$1,500 United States currency be authorized to effect settlement of this claim in accordance with the recommendations of the Acting Secretary of the Navy and the Acting Secretary of State.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 30, 1930.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—CLAIM OF THE OWNERS OF THE DANISH MOTOR-SHIP "INDIEN" (S. DOC. NO. 140)

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a further message from the President, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State in relation to a claim presented by the Government of Denmark for the payment of compensation to the owners of the Danish motor-ship *Indien* for damage sustained as a result of a collision with the United States Coast Guard cutter *Shawnee* at San Francisco on April 5, 1925, and I recommend that an appropria-

tion be authorized to effect a settlement of this claim in accordance with the recommendations of the Secretary of State.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 30, 1930.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CHINDELOM, from Monday, April 28, on account of illness.

To Mr. KURTZ, indefinitely, on account of illness.

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7356. An act for the relief of the American Foreign Trade Corporation and Fils d'Aslan Fresco.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House, in accordance with its previous order, adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, May 1, 1930, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Thursday, May 1, 1930, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—SUBCOMMITTEE ON PARKS AND PLAYGROUNDS

(10.30 a. m.)

To provide for the closing of Center Market in the city of Washington (S. J. Res. 77).

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

(10 a. m.)

To provide for the sale of the Government building site located on the State line dividing West Point, Ga., and Lanett, Ala.; for the acquisition in West Point, Ga., of a new site and for the erection thereon of a Federal building (H. R. 11515).

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(10.30 a. m.)

To consider branch, chain, and group banking as provided in House Resolution 141.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

(10 a. m.)

To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out his 10-year cooperative program for the eradication, suppression, or bringing under control of predatory and other wild animals injurious to agriculture, horticulture, forestry, animal husbandry, wild game, and other interests, and for the suppression of rabies and tularemia in predatory or other wild animals (H. R. 9599).

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Accounts. H. Res. 209. A resolution to pay Anne Falkenreck, sister of Carl F. Falkenreck, six months' compensation and an additional amount not exceeding \$250 to defray funeral expenses and last illness of the said Carl F. Falkenreck (Rept. No. 1341). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Education. S. 2113. An act to aid in effectuating the purposes of the Federal laws for promotion of vocational agriculture; without amendment (Rept. No. 1342). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOOVER: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 11900. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to Congress on the desirability of the acquisition of a portion of the Menominee Indian Reservation in Wisconsin for the establishment of a national park to be known as Menominee National Park; without amendment (Rept. No. 1343). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1959. A bill to authorize the creation of game sanctuaries or refuges within the Ocala National Forest in the State of Florida; without amendment (Rept. No. 1344). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MAAS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. J. Res. 299. A joint resolution to provide an annual appropriation to meet



the quota of the United States toward the expenses of the International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts; without amendment (Rept. No. 1345). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 11280. A bill to carry out certain obligations to certain enrolled Indians under tribal agreement; with amendment (Rept. No. 1346). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. GUYER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4101. A bill to extend the benefits of the employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Willie Louise Johnson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1339). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 10490. A bill for the relief of Flossie R. Blair; without amendment (Rept. No. 1340). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. YON: A bill (H. R. 12030) to transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury certain lands in Panama City, Bay County, Fla., for public-buildings purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 12031) granting certain public lands to the State of Utah for reservoir purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 12032) to provide for the appointment of two additional district judges for the southern district of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRUNNER: A bill (H. R. 12033) to regulate certain employment on public work; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 12034) to authorize the Comptroller of the Currency and/or the Federal Reserve Board to approve or disapprove the entry of any member bank in the Federal reserve system into group or chain banking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 12035) to amend subchapter 5 of chapter 18 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia by adding thereto a new section to be designated section 648-A; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 12036) authorizing the Public Printer to print and bind additional copies of Government publications for sale; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. PORTER: A bill (H. R. 12037) authorizing the payment of a claim presented by the Polish Government for the reimbursement of certain expenditures incurred by the community authorities of Rzeszczany, Poland, to which place an insane alien was erroneously deported; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS of California: A bill (H. R. 12038) authorizing the head of any executive department or officer to furnish copies of books, records, and papers within his custody, and permit the admission in evidence of such copies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAIL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 321) to authorize an appropriation of \$4,500 for the expenses of participation by the United States in an International Conference on the Unification of Buoyage and Lighting of Coasts, Lisbon, 1930; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PORTER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 322) authorizing payment of the claim of the Norwegian Government for interest upon money advanced by it in connection with the protection of American interests in Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 12039) granting an increase of pension to Frances A. Gallagher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12040) granting a pension to Laura E. Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRAND of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 12041) for the relief of W. C. Oleson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 12042) for the relief of the Consolidated Holding & Trust Co.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 12043) granting an increase of pension to Bertha A. Liming; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 12044) granting a pension to Annie Elizabeth Hull; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 12045) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Buck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. OWEN: A bill (H. R. 12046) for the relief of Daisy O. Davis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 12047) granting an increase of pension to Catherine D. Sage; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12048) granting an increase in pension to Mary Schaible; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANKIN: A bill (H. R. 12049) granting a pension to Charlotte Du Bose Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12050) for the relief of James Rodge McKelvey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THURSTON: A bill (H. R. 12051) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 12052) for the relief of H. B. Berry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12053) for the relief of Jessie Jameson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 12054) for the relief of Mary D. Gould; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

7167. By Mr. DEROUEN: Resolution from the mayor and board of aldermen of the town of Rayne, La., favoring an increase in compensation paid to officers and enlisted men, both active and retired, of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Public Health, and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

7168. By Mr. FENN: Resolution adopted by the court of common council of the city of Hartford, Conn., favoring the repeal of the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7169. By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of 500 veterans of the Central Branch of the National Military Home at Dayton, Ohio, asking that adjusted compensation certificates of \$40 or less be paid in cash and others paid in monthly installments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7170. By Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania: Petition of residents of Allegheny County, Pa., asking for the disposal of the Muscle Shoals project at this session of Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

7171. By Mr. CANNON: Memorial of common council of the city of St. Charles, State of Missouri, urging enactment of House Joint Resolution 167, directing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's memorial day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7172. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Harold Bean, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging favorable action on the silver amendment by Senator PRITMAN, since it will tend to boost the price of silver, and reemploy many people out of work due to closing of silver mines in the West; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7173. Also, petition of John Fitzpatrick and 15 other individual letters from citizens of the third congressional district, Brooklyn, N. Y., registering protest against the Federal education bill, H. R. 10, and contending that education is a local matter and not for governmental administration; to the Committee on Education.

7174. Also, petition of Abraham & Straus, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging opposition to the Vestal design copyright bill on the ground that it is harmful to retail business and will cause confusion and endless litigation if passed; to the Committee on Patents.

7175. By Mr. MANLOVE: Petition of Robert W. Cole and 211 others of the Veterans' Home, California, urging Congress to speedily pass the Manlove bill, H. R. 8976, for the relief of veterans and widows and minor orphan children of veterans of Indian wars; to the Committee on Pensions.

7176. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of Abraham & Straus Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing the passage of the Vestal copyright bill; to the Committee on Patents.